

THE  
SATURDAY REVIEW  
OF  
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 821, Vol. 32.

July 22, 1871.

[Registered for  
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

THE evils of government by party have often been deplored, but it remained for the present Ministry and Opposition to illustrate the inconvenience which may be caused by the conflict of parties in a passion. Lord SALISBURY took occasion, in the debate on the Army Bill, to exert his unrivalled powers of sarcasm and invective, but annoyance and irritation deliberately or unconsciously provoked cannot be described as novelties in debate. Mr. GLADSTONE may congratulate himself on returning the attack by a more solid and practical revenge. It is an unusual triumph to employ the prerogative of the Crown and to compromise the privileges of Parliament for the indulgence of political spite. By those who had considered the legal conditions of purchase, and who were familiar with Mr. GLADSTONE's turn of mind, the policy which was announced on Thursday to the House of Commons had not been unforeseen. Lord DERBY had sagaciously cautioned the House of Lords against offering a challenge to the Minister who might possibly take the question altogether out of the hands of Parliament; and Lord SALISBURY himself pointed out one of his epigrams by the remark that the only important provision of the Army Bill was not even necessarily a subject of legislation. As soon as the result of the ill-omened division in the House of Lords was known, the more or less confidential organs of the Government began to hint at a vigorous measure which would both disappoint the Peers and punish their military clients. Sir G. GREY arranged with the PRIME MINISTER and WAR SECRETARY the terms of a question to which the answer was the declaration that in three months the Royal Warrant which authorises purchase in the army would be cancelled. Mr. GLADSTONE lately declared that the House of Commons must either modify its Standing Orders or abdicate its functions as a governing Assembly. Few of his hearers were probably aware that some of the most important functions of Parliament are in form modern usurpations, which have never been sanctioned by law. The distinction between constitutional maxims and legal rules has generally rested on a recognition of the gradual extension of Parliamentary privilege or of personal liberty by unwritten usage. It has been for some generations more and more confidently assumed that, even in the exercise of its undoubted prerogative, the Crown must in grave political issues defer to the opinion of Parliament. Lord PALMERSTON and Lord CRANWORTH injudiciously attempted to disturb the established tradition by exercising the disused power of creating a peerage tenable only for life; but the House of Lords, under the guidance of Lord LYNCHURST, effectually defeated the anomalous experiment. Mr. GLADSTONE has revived in a more important matter the practice of disinterring a forgotten prerogative; and he probably believes himself to be acting in the spirit of the modern Constitution because he accomplishes with the aid of the Crown an object which the majority of the House of Commons had vainly striven to attain. His party, as usual, applaud his defiance of the House of Lords; but some moderate and thoughtful politicians reflect that a future Minister, if he feels secure of popular support, may possibly disregard the privileges of the House of Commons as well as of the House of Lords. The Crown still retains the right of refusing assent to a Bill which has passed both Houses, and the exercise of the veto would scarcely be a bolder innovation than the claim exclusively to regulate by prerogative the constitution of the army. The admirers of an appeal to the letter of the law from the spirit of modern legislation and government probably think themselves entitled to despise the anachronism of zealous attachment to thuribles, and chasubles, and periodical genuflections.

Mr. GLADSTONE, Mr. CARDWELL, and Lord GRANVILLE contended that they were enforcing a modern statutory power rather than a common-law prerogative of the Crown; but the Act which they quoted expressly recognised the prerogative which it practically restricted. Purchase had existed for more than a century before Parliament declared it to be illegal, except as far as it was regulated by Royal Warrant. As Sir G. GREY accurately stated, "the whole system of purchase rests, not upon Acts of Parliament, with one exception, but on Royal Warrants and Regulations which have been in force for a series of years, and which, by the Royal Prerogative, and without the intervention of Parliament, have been altered from time to time, and varied in many particulars during the last 150 years." The authority of Sir G. GREY was one of the indispensable elements of Mr. GLADSTONE's argument. Over-regulation prices were, according to the Minister, undeniably illegal, and Sir G. GREY's Commission had expressed an opinion that, as long as the sale of commissions was allowed, it was impossible to prevent an irregular excess of prices. It was therefore, according to Mr. GLADSTONE, the imperative duty of the Government, after many years of connivance, to terminate without a moment's delay the flagrant scandal of over-regulation prices by the only method which had seemed to Sir G. GREY and his colleagues likely to be effectual. The same Sir G. GREY, after listening to the speeches of Mr. GLADSTONE and Mr. CARDWELL, correctly asserted that purchase and the abolition of purchase were within the prerogative of the Crown. The controversy, in which the Ministers were obviously in the wrong, is verbal and legal, and it possesses no political importance. It had been generally taken for granted that the main object of the most important Bill of the Session was to be attained only by Parliamentary legislation, and not by prerogative, nor even by a statutory power of the Crown.

The House of Lords has, on the whole, no reason to regret a violent measure which will divert attention from its own defects of political wisdom. For an unseasonable collision in a wrongful cause with the House of Commons Mr. GLADSTONE has substituted the issue whether the country is to be governed by Parliament or by the Cabinet acting in the name of the Crown. If the House of Lords has been reminded of its helplessness in dealing with the purchase of commissions, the House of Commons is at the same time required to acknowledge that its three months' discussion of the Army Bill was an idle labour, worthy only of a mere debating society. It is not even a consolation that the House of Commons will be allowed to interfere for the ostensible purpose of setting the prerogative in motion by an Address to the Crown. If the QUEEN or the Cabinet can abolish purchase at the request of either House of Parliament, it is evident that the Royal Warrant might have been spontaneously cancelled. Lawyers and historians know perfectly well that the power of the Crown is theoretically great; but it is a new discovery that a system two hundred years old, and interests amounting to several millions of money, can be summarily suppressed without the form of a Parliamentary vote. Mr. GLADSTONE's superstitious reverence for the supposed right of the Crown to the reclaimed lands near the Thames Embankment was consistent with his new constitutional doctrine.

Nothing could be more natural than Mr. JACOB BRIGHT's exultation in the prospect of a violent change in the position and functions of the House of Lords; and down to Sir H. HOARE, the smaller revolutionary fry were pleasurably excited by Mr. GLADSTONE's announcement; but to graver politicians, including Sir G. GREY, although he had condescended to act the part of accomplice to the official conjuror, the sudden innovation on an established practice suggested reasonable

grounds of alarm. Mr. HARCOURT, who was supposed to be a constitutional jurist, enunciated the profound axiom that a Minister who acted in concert with a majority of the House of Commons could by no possibility exercise the lawless power of a dictator. "Prerogative," he added, "was a word not loved by the people of England, and it would have been well if before the decisive step was taken the approbation of the House of Commons had been asked." According to the theory of the Constitution, of which some traces remain in practice, the unanimous vote of the House of Commons can neither diminish nor increase in the smallest degree the prerogative of the Crown. It has long been foreseen by more cautious politicians than Mr. HARCOURT that, if the liberties of England are ever seriously infringed, the majority of the House of Commons will be responsible for the violation of right. Mr. HORSMAN, who since his return to Parliament has hitherto been one of the steadiest supporters of the Government, Mr. BOUVIERIE, and Mr. OSBORNE agreed in censuring the eccentric proceeding which Mr. GLADSTONE has adopted without even understanding that he was exerting a prerogative of the Crown. There is a strong presumption against the revival in altered circumstances of any obsolete authority. In the present instance, the prerogative which belonged to a real sovereign has entirely changed its character when it comes to be employed by the leader of the majority in the House of Commons. It is true that a similar transfer has in many other cases been gradually effected, but for the most part the Minister acts as the representative of Parliament. The intended abolition of purchase will have been effected in open disregard of the supposed privileges of both Houses.

The interest of the debate in the House of Lords has been in some degree superseded by more recent events, but the preponderance of argument and foresight, though not of eloquence, was largely in favour of the minority. Lord NORTHBROOK's lucid and comprehensive exposition of the Ministerial policy, Lord DERBY's weighty and statesmanlike appeal to political expediency, with the powerful speeches of the Duke of ARGYLL and Lord GRANVILLE, ought to have produced a different result. The House listened with respect to Lord RUSSELL, when as a political veteran he lauded the institutions and exploits of the past. Lord DALHOUSIE had the merit of honest conviction and of a thorough knowledge of the professional question; and Lord SALISBURY proved, not that purchase was tenable, or that it was desirable to reject the Bill, but that the Government had committed numerous errors of judgment and tact, and that all classes of Englishmen were open to uncompromising criticism. Yet it is the duty of Lord SALISBURY, as of statesmen of less intellectual power, to make the best of the Sparta in which his lot has been cast. Rebukes of what is existing and inevitable are wasteful exertions of power. The House of Lords has now an opportunity of redeeming a mistake by an extraordinary proof of forbearance; but there is reason to fear that Mr. GLADSTONE has provided for Lord GRANVILLE an almost insuperable difficulty in his attempt to profit by the ambiguous terms of the Duke of RICHMOND's amendment. The House of Lords displayed a lamentable want of judgment in postponing the Army Bill; but the Ministers have ingeniously furnished them with an admirable excuse for summarily rejecting it. An appeal to CÆSAR was always considered to supersede the necessity of an audience before an alternative tribunal. Mr. GLADSTONE has preferred to rely on the right of the Crown to determine the constitution of the army, and his enthusiastic supporters probably forget that one of their favourite commonplaces is the subordination of the Commander-in-Chief, who represents the Crown, to the Secretary of State, who is supposed to enjoy the confidence of Parliament. The House of Lords may fairly refuse to consider a project of legislation which has been practically declared by its promoters to be, in its most important part, inoperative and superfluous; yet perhaps they would act discreetly in considering the interests of the officers, who, between their friends and their enemies, between the Peers and Mr. GLADSTONE, are in no small danger of losing the property which few of them can afford to spare.

#### DECENTRALIZATION IN FRANCE.

THE French Assembly has for some time past been busy in considering how far the hold of the Central Government on the local authorities may safely be relaxed. Under the Empire, the Government appointed the Mayor in every commune, the Sub-Prefect in every *arrondissement*, and the

Prefect in every department. The Assembly has already decreed that in communes with less than 20,000 inhabitants the Mayors shall be elected by the Municipal Council, while in communes with more than 20,000 inhabitants the Mayors, though nominated by the Government, must be members of the Municipal Council at the time of their appointment. It is now proposed to venture somewhat further, and to attack centralization in the person of the hitherto omnipotent Prefect. The natural way of doing this would have been to make the office elective either by the inhabitants or by the Council of the department. By this means harmony would have been secured between the local Legislature and the local Executive, and the machinery for the administration of local affairs would have been complete and homogeneous. A motion to vest the election of the Prefects in the Council of the department was actually brought forward in the Assembly, but it seemed so radical to French eyes that it was rejected without a division. In its place a scheme has been invented, by which the Prefects are to be nominated by the Central authority, but are to be revented by the local authority from doing anything when they are nominated. This ingenious compromise is effected through the agency of a Departmental Commission, to be selected by the Council from among its own members, and to be possessed of large though somewhat indefinite powers in the way of controlling and supervising the Prefect's acts. This proposal was objected to by a section of the Left as an attempt to transplant English notions of decentralization to a soil to which they were unsuited. In France, it was argued, the Government rests on universal suffrage, and is administered by a freely elected Assembly and a Cabinet controlled by the Assembly. To restrain such a Government as this would be to turn against liberty the weapons she has herself employed against personal power. The communes ought to remain under the direct control of the National Assembly as the only means of ensuring the unity of France. Local Assemblies can only be vigorous where they are guided by a local aristocracy. Where this is wanting there will be no one capable of doing the work which it is proposed to assign to them. This reasoning shows both the weakness and the strength of the opposition to decentralization in France. The objection to turning against liberty the arms with which liberty has conquered the Empire is hardly true in fact. The growing desire for decentralization might have largely modified the Imperial system if NAPOLEON III. had not lost his throne in a war undertaken in the hope of preserving that system; but the General Councils of the departments had no actual share in the revolution. Yet it is not the less an objection which strikes at the root of constitutional administration. A free Government emancipated from control is in all essential respects a despotic Government, and unfortunately the more advanced section of French Liberals are not at all disinclined to a despotism, provided that the control of it is in the hands of men elected by the majority of the nation. When insisting on the difficulty of reconstructing local self-government in a country where local activity of all kinds has been so long discouraged, the opponents of decentralization have a stronger case. France is finding out by degrees that a nation which breaks with its traditions and its history cannot at pleasure link itself on to them again. For two centuries each successive Government has done its best to discourage local self-government, and it is not wonderful that the very materials out of which it can be framed should have died out under the sustained pressure. The lesson is not without its value even for Englishmen. At present their belief in local self-government is profound almost to absurdity; but in the reaction against this exaggerated view which is sure to come some day, they may be tempted to sweep away institutions which it may afterwards be found impossible to replace when their faults are forgotten and their substantial usefulness has been realized in the experiment how to do without them.

The principal amendment to the proposal of a Departmental Commission was moved by M. TARGET and the Baron DE JOUVENEL. Its object was to limit the functions of the Departmental Commission to superintending the execution of the decrees of the Council, and advising the Prefect upon matters in which the department is interested. The defenders of the Bill declared that this compromise would reduce what was intended to be a measure of decentralization to a simple nullity. A consultative Commission would be no real check on the Prefect, since he would at all times be free to disregard the advice given him. A Commission without independent powers would be a Commission without influence, authority, or energy. It would be centralization under another name. Both the



late and the present Ministers of the Interior supported the amendment. M. PICARD frankly confessed that he disliked the principle of decentralization and wished to limit its adoption as far as possible. The chief present need of France, he thought, was that the Central authority should be strengthened, and anything that lessened the power of the agents of the Government in the departments must lessen the power of the Government itself. M. LAMBRECHT declared that the Cabinet would not oppose the appointment of a Departmental Commission, though it had no great faith in its successful working; but, speaking in the name of his colleagues, he demanded that the functions of this Commission should be limited in the manner suggested by M. TARGET. The first clause of the amendment, which merely provided that there should be a Departmental Commission, and was consequently identical in substance with the corresponding clause in the Bill, was finally carried by 440 votes against 132. The second clause, which made the Commission simply consultative, was rejected by 338 votes against 220.

Of the other clauses of the Bill only two have provoked much discussion. To the clause enacting that each canton shall return one member to the General Council an amendment was moved giving a second member to cantons which have a population larger by one-half than the average population of the cantons in the department; but it was rejected by 441 votes against 149. M. WADDINGTON, the Reporter of the Committee, maintained that no such provision was needed, since the Councils will have nothing to do with politics, and the importance of the local interests represented in them cannot be measured by the numerical value of the constituencies. This argument, however, cuts both ways. The local interests of the large and the small cantons are not always identical, and as the small cantons are very much the more numerous, the system of giving one representative to each constituency without regard to population leaves the large cantons at their mercy whenever a conflict arises involving the raising or expenditure of the Departmental revenue. The determination of the majority of the Assembly to insist on equal representation suggests some doubts as to the sincerity of their assertion that the Councils are not intended to play any part in politics. Indeed it is by no means clear that any of the parties in the Assembly are acting with absolute sincerity, unless it be the Republicans of M. LOUIS BLANC's school. The return of these gentlemen to power seems sufficiently remote to make their views of the manner in which the Government should be carried on fairly disinterested. But the suddenly developed zeal of the Conservative and monarchical majority in favour of local independence is not above suspicion. It may have no other object than the better despatch of local business, and the extension of the political training which such better despatch implies. But it may also look forward to turning the Departmental Councils, and still more the Departmental Commissions, to account at some future day as a sort of hiding-place for local Conservatism when the tempest of democracy rages too fiercely in the National Assembly. It is hard to see in what way they are to be used for this purpose, but it is scarcely less hard to explain on any other supposition the resolution with which the majority of the Assembly have maintained their ground against the Government.

It is equally doubtful whether the Ministerial zeal for the unity of France is not mainly attributable to the convenience of having all the threads of local administration well in the hands of the Cabinet. The Prefect is an institution which it would go hard with any French Government to give up. Politically speaking, the French peasant is so well drilled that under ordinary circumstances he may be trusted to yield unquestioning obedience to any official who tells him how to vote. But if he once sees the man who has been to him as a God reined in on all sides by a permanent Departmental Commission, there is no saying that he will not be induced to transfer his allegiance to some sovereign less hampered by advisers. It is to be remarked that M. THIERS has not yet taken any part in the debates on this Bill, and consequently that the full strength of the Government has not as yet been brought into play. This may help to account for the curious fact that they have only extorted one concession from the Assembly. As the Bill was first framed, a Departmental Council could only be dissolved by an Act of the National Assembly, so that in the interval between one Session of the Assembly and another the Executive would have had no means of bringing a quarrel between itself and a Council to the issue of a fresh election. The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR naturally objected to so inconvenient a restriction, and a compromise was effected by which the chief of the Executive Power is authorised to dissolve a

General Council, when the Assembly is not sitting, provided that he gives his reasons for so doing, and that these reasons are specially applicable to the particular Council dissolved.

#### NEW INVESTMENTS.

EVERY day proposals are brought before the public for new investments of its money. It is natural that it should be so at present. Money is abundant. The calamities of 1866 have been accepted, surmounted, or forgotten, and the activity of English enterprise seeks new fields of employment. Probably, on the whole, it may be said that the experience of the last panic has done good, and that the investments now proposed are of a sounder and safer character than those which five or six years ago tempted to their ruin the foolish and sanguine herd of people in search of great and quick profits. But new investments have of course their risks, and it would be as well if quiet, honourable people knew a little better than they ordinarily do what are the criteria by which prospectuses ought to be tested. For those who consciously incur a risk it is needless to write. When a man or a woman takes, for example, shares in a Californian mine, he or she must be aware that the result may be a prize or it may be a blank. But most prospectuses profess to offer a safe, if lucrative, investment; and who is there that, reading such a prospectus, does not think it would be much pleasanter to get seven or ten per cent. than four or five? There are, however, some general rules by which all new schemes may be tested, and as they can be stated without any reference to any particular prospectus that has lately appeared, and without danger of writing down or writing up any one of the many recent proposals for investment, it may be useful to describe them briefly. Those who are accustomed to scrutinize matters of this sort have guides which the public cannot have. Very often the names of the brokers and of the solicitors attached to the prospectus at once show something of the real value of the undertaking. The public looks almost exclusively to the names of the Directors; but this, although sometimes a good guide, is often a very bad one. A perfectly honest nobleman, or squire, or general, or admiral, may figure in a list of Directors in connexion with a scheme of the real value of which he has no knowledge whatever; but brokers and solicitors of a high class do not like to connect themselves with undertakings the weak points of which are evident to their practised eyes. Persons, however, to whom the names of almost all London brokers and solicitors are strange can learn nothing from reading the mere personal part of the prospectus, and must look at the contents of the prospectus itself. It would, we think, be of advantage to them if, in studying these contents, they had a few simple rules to guide them. The contents of prospectuses are so various that it is impossible to do more than to take some few leading types as examples, but perhaps what may be said of these selected examples will throw some light on other schemes the nature of which may be slightly different.

The first example we will take is that of foreign loans. As a general rule, the risk that is run in subscribing to a foreign loan is more easily ascertained than the risk in subscribing to other forms of new investments. The market value of a new loan is determined by the consent of all the Exchanges of Europe, and the only questions about a foreign loan are whether the borrowing nation can and will pay the interest and sinking fund, if there is a sinking fund, and whether the price of issue is a fair one. There cannot possibly be any general rules teaching whether Italy, or Russia, or the United States, or France, will continue to keep faith with their public creditors. Persons must judge for themselves on these points, as also they must when they are asked to lend more money to nations which habitually make new loans to pay the interest on old debts. All that can be said is that generally the price of issue represents very fairly the current opinion in Europe of the value of the security. But opportunity may be taken of this instance to advert to a point which is common to all proposals for new investments. Most people will have observed that almost all new schemes are quoted at a premium. Those who are not acquainted with the secrets of the Stock Exchange ought to understand much more clearly than we fear they do that this quotation at a premium is no guide whatever to the value of the investment. In exceptional cases it may really express the opinion of competent persons that the price of issue is advantageous, and that it will answer to get an allotment; but, as a general rule, the premiums quoted for new investments are wholly fictitious. They are really nothing but a method by which

the promoters of the scheme protect themselves against unscrupulous opponents. The Stock Exchange allows stocks and shares to be dealt in directly the proposal for issuing them is made. Opponents could, therefore, sell the proposed issue, and drive it to a discount; but as this would deter the public from subscribing, the promoters of the scheme have recourse to the counter operation of buying at a premium. Into the precise working of these schemes and counter schemes it is not necessary to enter. All that it is needed to know is, that generally the premium represents Stock Exchange operations, and not the opinion of good judges and honest investors as to the value of the security offered.

The next instance we will take is that of proposals for the issue of Railway Debenture Stock on minor lines. Many of the proposals for issues of this kind have been amongst the most legitimate recently made. The panic of 1866 left a number of minor railways uncompleted or in difficulties; and partly by separate Acts of Parliament, partly by schemes under the sanction of the Court of Chancery, permission has been given to create sufficient capital to complete or free the undertaking with a priority over all other claims. To invest in these Preferential Debenture Stocks is often a very prudent mode of placing money. But there are two cautions which investors should bear in mind. In the first place, it should be noted what is the amount per mile which the proposed issue will reach. The investors can but have the produce of the railway, and if the railway when finished will consume more of their money per mile than it is worth, it will do them no good that they have a preference over other persons whose position is worse than their own. No general rule can be laid down, for a new or branch line may be likely to become an integral part of a main line taking 40*l.* or 50*l.* per mile per week; but ordinarily, if an investor finds that the Preferential Debenture Stock will exceed 5,000*l.* per mile, he ought to be on his guard, and to inquire what are the exceptional circumstances that justify the excess. In the next place, he should most attentively consider how the line is to be worked. It is often assumed that lines can be worked at fifty per cent. of the gross earnings; but this is not at all true of new small lines at first starting; and whatever the prospectus may say, he will do well to assume that the working expenses will at first be not much less than seventy per cent. But this is not all. The investor must see that the new money provided will not only complete the line, but provide adequate rolling stock; for obviously a line is of no use unless there are engines and carriages to run on it; and although rolling stock may be hired, it is always hired at a ruinous expense. Further, there is a danger to which investors are very little alive. They have a first claim upon the net earnings, but the rolling stock does not belong to them, but to the Company, and is liable to seizure for the Company's debts. If, therefore, there are any creditors of the Company whose claims are not, by the Act or Scheme creating the preferential capital, postponed to the claims of the contributors of that capital, the holders may see the rolling stock taken away from them, and thus their property rendered temporarily valueless. Generally claims existing at the date of the Act or Scheme are so postponed; but the Company, before it can issue its new Debenture Stock, may have gone through new difficulties, and thus claims may have been created against which investors, unless they have adequate experience, are not sufficiently on their guard.

Lastly, there are new Companies proposed, to the shares of which investors are invited to subscribe. Here, again, only hints of the most general kind can be given, for many of these new Companies are undoubtedly sound and honest schemes. But, in the first place, investors should understand what are the drawbacks of all Companies managed by Boards. The Directors are charged with the management, but the Directors do not really, as a rule, look after the practical everyday working of the Company. They cannot do so, and are not paid for doing so. They are for the most part, if not mere hacks or dummies, wealthy men, or men with very various occupations, and they only get a very small yearly payment, and give up a very small amount of their time and thoughts to the business they nominally manage. This answers very well when the nature of the business is such that all that is required is occasional superintendence as a check upon the officials who are really paid for doing the work; but where more is wanted, where the nature of the business is such that intelligent and constant supervision on the part of the higher authorities is needed, Boards generally break down, unless the direction is either so constituted that men of real business habits are induced and are properly paid to give constant attention to the concern, or some one person, such as the

Chairman, or a General Manager, is appointed with adequate remuneration to look closely after the undertaking. In the next place, investors, if they will take the trouble to observe what is going on, may notice that there are fashions in the kind of Companies started. At one time there is a flush of new banks, at another time of new Telegraph Companies, at another time of new Mining Companies. Just now the rage is for Tramway Companies. It almost always happens that the fashion is set going by some indisputable instance of success, and then schemes are started to rival this success. Investors should be very much on their guard against proposals of this imitative character. Nothing more than caution is necessary. It may very possibly happen that out of twenty new schemes for tramways the twentieth is the best; but almost all the great losses that have overwhelmed innocent speculators have been due to unsound schemes being started in imitation of sound schemes of the same sort. Prudent people ought to hold it to be an argument against a new scheme that it is one of a number which are supposed to meet a temporary fancy of the public. This argument will of course fade away if the particular scheme they are considering offers exceptional advantages; if, for example, the proposed tramway is in a populous district, if the cost per mile is very low, and if the contractors are thoroughly trustworthy, and an adequate supply of rolling-stock is to be provided. But if these conditions are not fulfilled, investors in tramways may suffer from giving way to the excitement of a passing fashion, just as investors in ill-planned railways suffered a few years ago. They ought not to be deterred by these considerations from calmly investigating the merits of any of the tramway schemes now daily offered to their notice, but they ought to beware of accepting as a general truth that tramways will pay, and applying this principle indiscriminately to every scheme for a new tramway made at any cost in any part of the world.

#### THE FRENCH ARMY.

THE French would not be themselves, it may be said they would not be a great nation, if even in the hour of humiliation and distress they did not think how they may best get a new army worthy of France, and blot out the stains on their military glory. Politicians of all parties seem agreed that the basis of a new army must be the universal liability of the citizen to serve. The particular results to which this universal liability to serve would lead are not of much real importance. We hear of an army of 800,000 men to be ready to take the field, and another army of 800,000 men to be kept in reserve. These figures are enormous, but the only limit there would be to the size of a really national army is the amount of men that the nation might choose to pay for and the amount of men that would be of any real use in war. But, in one shape or other, and to an extent far outnumbering the armies of the past, France will have, it cannot be doubted, a new national army, in which every Frenchman will be as much bound to serve as every German is bound to serve in the German army. France has, indeed, no choice in the matter. Germany has already got such an army as France is only proposing to have, and Russia has already begun to imitate the example of Germany. France must, in self-defence, have an army on the same model, or she would permanently sink into the position of a minor military Power. There may be difficulties and dangers in the way, but they are not of a kind to deter a nation from doing that which it must do if it is to be a great nation. The cost will be very considerable, and France is coming under the burden of heavy new taxation. The problem how these new taxes are to be raised has thrown its shadow over the path of M. THIERS sooner than was expected. The Commission on the Budget has condemned by a large majority his favourite duties on raw materials; and if it is hard to devise new taxes, it seems simple to do away with a part of the necessity by reducing the expenditure, and especially the expenditure on the army and navy. But want of money will not stop a nation from taking those measures which are believed to be really necessary to give it safety or to restore its name before the world. If France is rich enough to pay its public creditors, it will also, we may be sure, somehow find the money to reorganize its army. Frenchmen will insist on having a force numerically strong, and will try to get these levies turned into soldiers fit to fight even Germans. We are quite certain that every Englishman would do exactly the same under the circumstances, and in estimating the financial prospects of France it



is necessary to begin with assuming that, in face of the gigantic national armies of Russia and Germany, France will have a gigantic national army of its own whatever may be the cost.

At present the first thought in every French breast is that this gigantic national army, when created, shall avenge Sedan. It is impossible that this feeling should not exist. The surrender of a whole French army after one day's fighting is an event unparalleled in modern history. If our whole Channel Fleet was to be carried off into Cherbourg after one day's fighting, we may be sure that we should never rest until we had retrieved the disgrace. But although Sedan was a great catastrophe, it was much more a political than a military catastrophe; and perhaps some day the French will feel this in some measure, and derive a certain amount of consolation from it. Things had got into such an absurd political tangle, that a woman and a third-rate General in Paris were able to force the Sovereign of the country and the best of French Generals to take, against their better judgment, the only large army France had left into a position where it had no chance. It might indeed have had some little chance of doing better than it did, and of averting complete ruin; but this little chance was lost to it by the shameful neglect and indolence of DE FAILLY, who, although advised to get away his men from Beaumont by nine in the morning, had not stirred a man at noon. But then DE FAILLY was a totally unfit man, only allowed to command a division because he was an Ultramontane and a friend of the EMPRESS. France was cruelly humiliated at Sedan, but the humiliation can scarcely be called a military one. The EMPEROR and MCMAHON fought with the utmost courage, and the soldiers who had upheld in action the name of France burnt with indignation at the shame with which they had been covered by the politicians to whom a strange freak of fortune had confided the destinies of the army. If a system is finally established in France which will render it impossible that a woman and a clerical clique should send French soldiers into positions chosen contrary to every principle of military science, it is just possible that the reflection that another Sedan was impossible might make the memory of Sedan less bitter. So, too, in time France may, if Lorraine and Alsace become satisfied with their lot, gradually cease to mourn keenly over the loss of those two fine provinces. But Metz is a very different thing. The loss of Metz is not a sentimental loss; it is a practical permanent loss, against which nothing is to be set. France lies open to the invader as long as he holds Metz; while he himself is secured from invasion by holding it. France can never give up the hope of recovering Metz, unless she is convinced that to recover it is altogether beyond her strength. The Germans deliberately retained Metz knowing that this was so. They argued that France would always wish to renew the war unless she were prevented by a constant abiding source of fear, and they said that this source of fear was to be found in the German possession of Metz. The argument may have been right or wrong; but just as it is certain that France will somehow have a gigantic national army, so it is certain that nothing but the sheer consciousness that it is no match for the German army with its new advantages of position will keep this gigantic national French army from trying to get back Metz.

The creation of the new national army in France will not improbably lead to political difficulties. As it is, there is already a great political difficulty in connexion with the French army. Almost all its officers were prisoners in Germany when GAMBETTA raised and had to officer the million of men whom he is justly proud of having sent into the field. Now that the war is over, and the German prisoners returned, there are two sets of officers, each with great claims to be the real officers of an army which certainly does not require both. The older officers had given up their lives to their vocation, and suffered adversity in the discharge of their duty. Why, they ask, should they be turned adrift and condemned to misery and inaction because the fortune of war was against them? BAZAINE may have commanded at Metz very badly, but a captain or lieutenant in his army had only to obey BAZAINE's orders; and when peace restores him to his country, he ought still to find his proper place in his profession. On the other hand, France chose to raise new armies and to appoint new officers, and these officers did their best, worked very hard to get their men ready for the field, and though for the most part wholly ignorant of their business, yet were sincerely anxious to fulfil the expectations of the country. Having come forward in an hour of desperate trial to uphold the honour of France, with the complete sanction and approval of the nation, they ought not, as they reasonably urge, to be thrown aside as useless now that the

war is over. There are thus a set of old Imperialist officers on the one side, and a set of new GAMBETTA officers on the other, and it is impossible but that much discontent should prevail, whatever may be the result. The Government has done the most sensible thing it could by appointing a Commission, consisting of two officers of the old army, two officers of the new army, and an admixture of tolerably impartial civilians, to decide between the rivals, and to make the best compromise possible. But many must be disappointed, and disappointed officers are unquestionably a dangerous element in a society like that of France such as it is at present. Then, again, if there is an enormous citizen army, this army will be very apt to follow the usual fatal French precedent, and think more of politics than of military discipline. The dangerous institution of National Guards will be done away with, and one element of constant disorder will thus be removed from the population of large towns. But the army itself, if it is to reach the number of a million and a half of men, will have many of the feelings and tendencies of the old National Guards; and there will always be a danger of a part of the army separating from the rest, and of those military pronunciamientos being instituted which have been such a curse to Spain and to Spanish Republics. These are serious dangers, but France has to face them. France cannot go on without an army on the German and Russian scale because discontented officers may try to tamper with the fidelity of troops, or because the army may give way to political passions. Frenchmen will insist on having an adequate French army, whatever may be the risk; and all that can be done is to avert, by prudence and the spread of general enlightenment, so much of the danger easily to be foreseen as it may be found possible practically to guard against.

#### THE BALLOT DEBATES.

IF the zealous opponents of the Ballot had studied either human nature or Mr. GLADSTONE's character, they would have withheld their triumphant and unauthorised announcement that the Bill was about to be withdrawn. The most patient and considerate of Ministers might have been excused for hinting to the House of Commons that, if the Opposition persisted in talking against time, there was time enough to beat them in the struggle. Mr. GLADSTONE, in his usual fashion, solemnly warned the House that it should have no holidays until it had deserved indulgence at his hands. In the present instance, the majority is not disinclined to support him even in rigorous measures; and one devoted adherent has gone so far as to propose that Mr. FORSTER and his adversaries should, until the Bill is disposed of, not even be allowed a couple of hours for dinner. Nothing can be more true than the statement on the other part that the measure was neither urgent nor even extraordinarily popular; but it is perfectly well known that the immediate promotion of the Ballot was pressed on the Government rather as a test than as a policy. The extreme Liberals were indignant both at the tolerance of religious teaching contained in the Education Act, and at their own repeated local defeats in the School Board elections; and other accumulated discontents of three Sessions tended to render the members below the gangway generally restless and irritable. The most obvious method of appeasing real and pretended dissatisfaction was to adopt the catchword by which, for one or two generations, the more advanced section of Liberals has been conventionally recognised. Mr. GLADSTONE himself was probably impatient to prove the sincerity and earnestness of the most recent of his political conversions; and there was an incidental advantage in allowing Mr. FORSTER, as a genuine devotee of the Ballot, to recover a portion of the favour which he had forfeited by his preference of duty to faction in the conduct of the Education Bill. Many other reasons might be suggested for the selection of the Ballot Bill as the second Ministerial measure of the Session; and when the choice had once been approved by large majorities in the House, the Government could not be blamed for persevering.

The members of the Opposition would, if they had been guided by the counsels of their leaders, have adopted the dignified course of submitting to necessity after a fair trial of their strength. A victory in argument is the only consolation for a defeat by force of numbers, and the beaten party gains nothing by additional proofs of its inferiority in strength. As it happened that the second reading had been allowed to pass without a division, Mr. CROSS's motion against going into Committee provided a not less convenient opportunity of

trying the question of principle, or rather of party. Since that time several weeks have been unprofitably devoted to a succession of speeches and divisions which must have been principally, though not exclusively, intended to cause delay. If, indeed, there were any members who thought public nominations desirable, they were justified in protesting against the abolition of an ancient and obsolete custom; but it was not the business of the minority to meddle with the construction of ballot-boxes, or with the question between cards and folded pieces of paper. Mr. FOWLER had the merit of devising the most preposterous amendment which has occupied the time of the Committee. There was a perverse ingenuity in the suggestion that, as a security against personation, every voter should be compelled to stand for a definite time at the entrance of the polling-booth, with his face turned to the mob outside, as if to invite a volley of missiles. The arrangement would have been highly palatable to the Irish faction which some time since prevented the multiplication of polling-booths because it was feared that landlords and docile tenants might, by the proposed plan, obtain additional facilities for voting in safety. Mr. LOWTHER's more rational project of voting-papers was objectionable on the ground that it was avowedly intended as an alternative for the Ballot; and, in general, it may be said that the details of the measure ought to have been left to the discretion of the Government and the majority. Any contrivance which is adopted by the promoters of the Bill may be supposed to render the Ballot more efficient; and if, after all, the measure fails to insure perfect secrecy, the advocates of open voting will have no reason to regret the result. The object may, in fact, be easily attained by any one of a dozen different methods, or, if the machinery which may be adopted proves to be defective, it can at any time be amended.

Memory refuses to retain the various amendments and arguments which have lately occupied a large portion of the time of the House of Commons. To remonstrances on their dilatory tactics members of the Opposition frequently reply that fifteen or sixteen years ago Mr. GLADSTONE, in his resistance to the Divorce Bill, consumed for his own share as much time as all the adversaries of the present Bill have collectively wasted; but Mr. GLADSTONE is an exceptional person, and his proceedings are not always deserving of comparison into precedents. A better excuse may be found in the resolution of the majority to vote in silence for all the clauses of the Bill. Legitimate irritation is not conducive to the rapid transaction of business. It would probably have been found impossible to carry the Bill through the House if it had not been entrusted to the conduct of a Minister who never makes enemies. If the feelings of the Opposition had been more carefully considered, it might have been possible to convince their more reasonable members that the Government, having introduced the measure, afforded no reasonable ground of complaint by insisting on giving effect to the votes of the House of Commons. The Ballot Bill is not, like the unfortunate Army Regulation Bill, a mass of details, although it was necessary to introduce clauses for the regulation of future elections. The minute discussion of the provisions of the Bill has been gratuitously instituted by critics few of whom had a serious desire to improve legislation. A large and respectable part of the community, including many Ministerial members, would have gladly witnessed the rejection of the Bill; but the abuse or excessive use of Parliamentary forms to baffle a majority tends to make sympathy change sides. The essence of free government is that all disputes shall be settled by voting, and that the defeated party shall submit with as much cheerfulness as the occasion may allow. There is no appeal from the representatives of the constituency which has resulted from rival bids for popularity. Mr. DISRAELI, who is evidently indisposed to sanction the conduct of his party, observes from time to time, with a certain amount of truth, that the Ballot is unnecessary, and that it would be better that Parliament should concern itself with the regulation of mines, or, in his own phrase, of subterranean employments, or some other useful and harmless course of action; but the author of household suffrage was bound to know that the promoters of democratic Reform Bills had always demanded secret voting; and he might easily have foreseen that the next Parliament would adopt the favourite measure of the party which could not fail to become dominant. It would perhaps have been desirable that the next general election should be determined by votes publicly given; but the utmost ambition of the opponents of the Ballot is to postpone the innovation for three or four years. MICHAEL, in *Paradise Lost*, judiciously reminded his great antagonist that they both knew one another's force, and

that the celestial balance inclined, as might be expected, in favour of the champion of Heaven. The chief of the subterranean Opposition, whatever might be his opinion of the justice of his cause, at once acknowledged the inutility of fighting for the sole purpose of ascertaining a foregone conclusion. Mr. DISRAELI is capable of emulating the good sense of his prototype, and the members of his party may advantageously profit by his example and precepts; yet Mr. DISRAELI himself on Thursday night lost his temper, unless the counsel for the Government was right in suspecting that he only pretended to lose it. It is difficult to apportion the respective effects of the Purchase question and the Ballot question in disturbing Parliamentary equanimity. It was after an evening of great and varied excitement that Mr. FORSTER was induced to refer to the possible action of the House of Lords, and that Mr. DISRAELI denounced a shameful conspiracy of the Ministers against the same Assembly. Sir JOHN PAKINGTON had previously declared that four hours had been wasted in a debate on the clauses of the Ballot Bill, which had, as Mr. GLADSTONE sarcastically remarked, been confined to speakers on the side of the Opposition. Mr. FORSTER had indeed, with single-handed gallantry, met all comers; but both parties have so far right on their side that they are respectively resenting vexatious proceedings on the part of their adversaries. As usual in similar cases, one side undertakes the defence of principles which more properly belong to the other. It was scarcely the business of the Conservative party to facilitate the voting of the illiterate electors who have been introduced into the constituencies in large numbers by the last Reform Bill. It may be confidently anticipated that the Ballot Bill will pass the House of Commons, and that it will for the present Session be rejected by the House of Lords.

#### A PLEASANT ANNIVERSARY.

TO-MORROW is the anniversary of the foolish and disgraceful riot in which Mr. BEALES's mob pulled down the railings of Hyde Park, and otherwise misconducted themselves, and "a large body of Democrats" intend, we are told, to commemorate the event by a picnic in the country. It may be regretted that the proposed excursion is not to some more distant spot and of less limited duration; but the good taste of the celebration will be generally appreciated. Whatever one may think of the propriety of holding meetings in the Parks, we should have imagined that everybody would be glad to forget the miserable disturbances which attended the assertion of the supposed right on this occasion. The insolence of mob leaders, egging on their followers to mischief, while careful to keep on the safe side of the law themselves; the wild elements thus called forth; the weakness and vacillation of Ministers, were never more painfully and conspicuously displayed. For three days the Park was given up to the roughs and scum of the metropolis; the first day they destroyed the railings and stoned the police, and the other two days were spent in a variety of lively sports, such as breaking down trees, hooting, and occasionally saluting with brickbats the riders and people in the carriages, and smashing the windows of "aristocrats" in the neighbourhood. Then came Mr. WALPOLE's abject capitulation, and the treacherous use which Mr. BEALES and his associates made of the poor gentleman's emotion. Mr. WALPOLE's proposal to refer the question to the Law Courts was twisted into a permission to hold another meeting in the Park, which was immediately announced to be "an arrangement with the Government." When the falsehood was exposed Mr. BEALES instigated his followers to resistance, but, with characteristic discretion, declined to lead them to the fight. "If," he said, "he were at the head of an armed body, he would not flinch; but he would never, at the head of an un-armed people, bring them against a police whom he had no hesitation in designating as a band of unmitigated ruffians." For this conduct Mr. BEALES has since been made a Judge, and it will not be forgotten how Mr. BRIGHT stimulated the rioters by an inflammatory letter which was placarded about the streets, while Mr. GLADSTONE encouraged them no less effectually by his expressive and persistent silence. Sir GEORGE GREY alone had the courage and candour to support the Government in their efforts to preserve order, and acknowledged manfully that he had given precisely the same orders as Mr. WALPOLE before he left office. The law of the question was clear and simple. After the Sunday Trading disturbances in 1855, the Government of the day—a Liberal Government—appointed a Commission to inquire into the proceedings, and the question of right of meeting in the Parks, which was then raised. The Commission reported that it was necessary that measures should be taken to enable all



persons to ride or drive in the Parks undisturbed; that warning should be issued that such proceedings as had been recently contemplated were illegal, as being novel and not sanctioned by usage; and that Hyde Park was not a proper arena for large assemblies of persons for political discussion. In the following year a question was raised whether bands and preaching were to be allowed in the Parks, and the opinion of the law officers of the Crown was as follows:—"The authority to close and to exclude the public from the Parks is that which every landowner has to prevent the public from trespassing on his land; for we are of opinion that the public have not acquired any legal right to use the Parks by reason of the continued user under the license and by favour of the Crown." This was signed by Sir A. COCKBURN, Sir R. BETHELL, and Mr. W. H. WILLES, who were not only eminent lawyers but decided Liberals in their political views. It may be objected that the view they took of this question was based on narrow technical grounds; but it is clear that the Government stood in the place of the original landowner, the Crown, and that, apart from proprietary rights, it was not only entitled but bound to enforce such regulations in the Parks as would secure to all classes the free and equal enjoyment of them. It was on the strength of this legal opinion that Mr. WALPOLE authorised the police to forbid the meeting in Hyde Park, as "inconsistent with the purposes for which the Park is thrown open," and his predecessor in office justified the prohibition, and intimated that he had himself resolved to take the same course when he first heard of the proposed gathering.

The proposed excursion to celebrate this agreeable anniversary, however silly and offensive in itself, has not been without some good results. In the first place, it is perhaps as well that at the present moment, when the right of meeting in the Parks is again under discussion, the circumstances under which that right has for some time been practically admitted should be brought to mind. In the next place, the excursion has led to the postponement of a "mass meeting," which was to have been held on the same day in Hyde Park to protest against the clause which has been introduced into Mr. AYRTON'S Bill, interdicting speeches and addresses in the Parks, "except in accordance with the rules of the Park." The prohibition is not quite so absolute as could be desired, and the condition by which it is qualified might no doubt be used to neutralize its effect. It is probable, however, that the Minister charged with the execution of the law would hesitate to take upon himself the responsibility of violating the express and obvious intention of one of its chief provisions. It was unfortunate that the pusillanimous blundering of the authorities in 1866 prevented the question from receiving dispassionate consideration, but it would be intolerable if important public rights were to be permanently left at the mercy of accidents of that kind. The strategical error of attempting to keep the mob out of the Park on such an extended line was outdone by the gross political error of first prohibiting and then tolerating illegal meetings, under the pressure of physical violence. The rabble have not been slow to learn the lesson so sedulously inculcated, and the authority of Government has been sensibly shaken by the spectacle of successful and unpunished turbulence. Whether it is or is not desirable that the Parks should be made the arena of excited political controversy, is a question which anybody is free to argue who chooses, but no doubt should have been permitted to remain as to the state of the law. In point of fact, the law is precisely the same as when successive Home Secretaries, supported by authoritative legal advice, declared that meetings could not be allowed in the Parks. Yet for five years meetings have been repeatedly held there, under the protection of the police, and in direct violation of the law. The factious conduct of the Liberal leaders, smarting under defeat and reckless how they took their revenge, rendered it impossible to proceed with Lord JOHN MANNERS'S Bill, which would have settled the question. It may possibly be argued that the experience of the last few years has proved the harmless character of these demonstrations. It is true there has been no bloodshed or serious injury either to the Parks or adjoining property; but this is only a lucky accident. It is a sufficient objection to gatherings of this description, that they interfere with the primary object of the Parks, which is the recreation of the public. It is surely desirable that there should be some place where people can walk about and enjoy the grass, the trees and flower-beds, and that sense of open space which is one of the principal charms of the Parks, without being hustled and disturbed by political agitators. To quiet, peaceable people the demonstrations are a nuisance, and as such ought to be suppressed.

It was not to be expected that so reasonable and necessary a proposal as that meetings should be forbidden in the Parks would pass without a howl of opposition from those who have exclusively enjoyed the benefit of the license. The little knot of revolutionary agitators whose head-quarters are the taproom of an Old Bailey tavern, and who are continually passing themselves off under fresh but equally grandiloquent designations, has just turned up under a new name. Its latest *alias* is the "Public Rights Association," and in this capacity it has been protesting energetically and with characteristic energy of speech against the proposed interdict on political gatherings. The Chairman thought that the most appropriate and effectual answer to this tyrannical proposal would be a "mass meeting" in Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon. It was considerably suggested by one of the speakers that "the people" should wait to see what the Government meant to do in the matter, as, "in the event of the failure of moral force, they possessed that physical force which was often so efficacious in matters of this kind." A delegate from Hackney undertook that the East End should be present in its thousands; but it was discovered that "large numbers of Democrats" were going next Sunday on an excursion to celebrate the Hyde Park anniversary, and the mass meeting was therefore postponed for another week. A solicitor who was present favoured the meeting with a legal argument, the gist of which was that, as long as the Crown took the Civil List in lieu of the surrender of its rights in the Parks, the people were entitled to enjoy that for which they paid their money. The assertion is indisputable, but everything turns on the question, who are "the people." We cannot admit that the people are represented by the gentlemen of the taproom and the pavement who are perpetually parading in fresh disguises, like an operatic chorus, peasants in one act and brigands in another. It is a very significant circumstance that in the People's Parks throughout the country, with which neither the Crown nor the Government has anything whatever to do, and which are under the control of the local authorities as immediately representing "the people," we find that public meetings and addresses of every kind, whether religious or political, with the exception of some school gatherings, are strictly forbidden. At Halifax, Barnsley, Bolton, Aston Park (Birmingham), all preaching and spouting are prohibited. At Finsbury and Southwark Parks, which are under the management of the Metropolitan Board of Works, similar rules are in force. In the Royal Parks preaching has been for some time under an interdict, and political ranting has surely no better claim to toleration. If meetings in the Parks are to be legalized, where are we to stop? If Mr. ODGER and Mr. BRADLAUGH are to have a right to assemble their friends and deliver highly stimulating speeches whenever they choose, the same right cannot be denied to all the other sects of politics and religion. Hitherto the demagogues who have been accustomed to gather round the Reformers' Tree have been treated with good-humoured contempt by the classes against whom their splenetic diatribes have been mainly directed. They have had it all their own way, and consequently the only disorders which have arisen have been due to the exuberant spirits of the demonstrators themselves, which led them to break down the trees, frighten the children, and indulge in similar pleasing frolics. But if any question arose between different sections of their own order, as between the Garibaldians and Irish a few years back, and quite recently between the Internationalists and the Catholics, we should then witness the tug of war, and the police would find it very difficult to determine on which side they should interfere, or whether they had not better leave the infuriated controversialists to break each other's heads to their hearts' content. Moreover, if there are to be political gatherings in the Parks, why not other entertainments? The Recreative Religionists, hurdy-gurdy boys, jugglers, German bands, Punch and Judy, india-rubber families, and human pyramids have just as much right to collect an audience by advertisement or tuck of drum and go through their tricks in the Parks, as any of the high-sounding Leagues or Associations under the names of which the demagogues of the Old Bailey and Hatton Garden are accustomed to masquerade. A revival of Barthlemy Fair by the waters of the Serpentine would be more amusing and not more preposterous than a universal right of public meeting. And, again, if the "proprietary rights of the people" justify, as Mr. MERRIMAN argues, the unrestricted freedom of political demonstrations in the Parks, why not in other places which are equally, if not more, the property of the public? Why should not Mr. ODGER have as good a right to give an International *soirée* to our London Bellevillists in the

South Kensington Museum as Lord HENRY LENNOX and the Society of Arts? Our English climate is by no means propitious to open-air assemblies. Are "the people" to be denied the shelter of a roof when the National Gallery and the British Museum, and other public buildings, stand temptingly at hand? It is unfortunate that the rights of the public at large should have been sacrificed for several years through party factionousness and official imbecility; but it is not too late to restore wholesome regulations which should never have been suspended.

#### MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS AND PRIVATE BILLS.

A BILL of considerable importance to Municipal Corporations and to their constituents is now pending in the House of Commons; and although it will certainly not be passed during the present Session, it is desirable that it should be discussed with a view to future legislation. Mr. LEEMAN, who introduces the Bill, proposes that, under certain restrictions, the governing bodies of towns should be authorised to apply the borough funds to the purpose of promoting or opposing Private Bills affecting the interests of the community. In practice, Corporations have been in the habit of assuming to themselves without question the power which is now sought for them by the Bill; but the Municipal Act strictly defines the application of the borough fund; and the Court of Queen's Bench has lately decided, in the case of the *QUEEN v. the Corporation of Sheffield*, that the members of the municipal government, except in the rare instances when they have surplus property, defend or promote the interests of the borough at their own risk. In that case the Corporation had opposed before the Justices certain regulations issued by the Water Company as oppressive and injurious to the consumers; and they obtained material modifications in the rules to which they objected. The Water Company had at the same time deposited a Bill in Parliament to meet the contingency of a defeat before the Justices; and the Bill was withdrawn after a petition against it had been lodged by the Corporation. The expenses were in both cases charged to the borough fund; but some of the ratepayers, at the instance of the Water Company, brought the borough accounts by *certiorari* before the Queen's Bench; and the Court held that, although the proceedings of the Corporation had been not only justifiable but meritorious, the members of the body were personally liable for the costs. The Judges were undoubtedly right in their opinion that the law operated in this particular case to produce gross injustice, and it was absurd to suppose that the Water Company was acting in the interest of the ratepayers. The members of the Corporation, acting in good faith for the benefit of the borough, ought to have been indemnified against personal liability; but the list of amendments appended to the notice of Mr. LEEMAN's Bill shows that it is not likely to pass without question. No difficulty arises when an Improvement or other Municipal Act is passed, because a clause is invariably inserted to provide for the payment of costs; but unsuccessful promoters and opponents in all cases incur, under the decision of the Queen's Bench, a serious risk. The Metropolitan Board of Works have a special power of applying their funds to the expenses of Parliamentary contests; and perhaps there may be Corporations which have procured for themselves a similar privilege. In other cases Parliamentary Committees have refused to insert an enabling clause in Private Bills, on the intelligible ground that the question properly belongs to public legislation. If Mr. LEEMAN re-introduces his measure in a future Session, it will probably receive strong support from borough members; but it will encounter strenuous opposition.

A distinction may be reasonably drawn between promotion and opposition. When the interests of a corporate town are threatened by any Bill, it seems reasonable that the costs of opposing the scheme should be equally levied in the form of rates. On the other hand, it is seldom absolutely necessary to promote a Bill; and in some instances municipal funds might be employed in the acquisition of oppressive powers. Mr. CRAUFURD has given notice of an amendment, excepting from the provisions of Mr. LEEMAN's Bill applications to Parliament for the compulsory purchase of gas and water undertakings; and Companies in general will use their utmost efforts to secure the exemption, even if they fail to defeat the Bill. It was for the purpose of guarding against a risk of the kind that the Sheffield Water Company made their successful attempt to cripple the action of the Corporation; and it is true that, as a general rule, municipal bodies look with a covetous eye on local joint-stock enterprises. Parliament has never yet sanctioned an adverse Bill for the compulsory pur-

chase of gas or water, except where the Companies have exposed themselves to attack by promoting Bills of their own; but Committees have often put a strong pressure upon Companies by refusing them indispensable powers of constructing works or raising capital until they have consented to a sale. As the distinction which has been drawn, however plausible, is in substance artificial and arbitrary, Gas and Water Companies have good reason for anticipating future attacks on the part of Corporations. It is in the highest degree important to maintain the inviolability of private property, whether it is held in several possession or in the form of shares; but in the case of gas and water, the Corporations have something to say for themselves, if only they are prepared to purchase at the full value. When Parliament, five-and-twenty years ago, restricted the dividend on gas and water capital, it virtually appropriated to the consumers, who are nearly identical with the ratepayers, the reversion or surplus of profits after the payment of a dividend of ten per cent. As soon as the maximum is obtained, the proprietors become mere trustees or annuitants, with no motive for increasing the profit of the undertaking or meeting the growing wants of the consumer. The Corporation, which may be supposed to represent the reversioner, naturally desires to administer the property of its constituents for their exclusive benefit; and if it is willing to pay the maximum dividends in perpetuity, or to commute them for an equivalent sum, it proposes a fair bargain. A large number of Gas Companies have attained their maximum dividend, but the supply of water has for the most part been found less profitable. If Corporations were allowed to apply the borough funds to promoting Bills for the purchase, at their full value, of undertakings which have attained a maximum dividend, it would be difficult for the Companies to establish a reasonable ground of complaint. It is probable that the costs of the Sheffield Water Company in the recent litigation were paid out of their capital at the contingent expense of the consumer. The intermediate course of giving municipal authorities a power of interfering with Companies is highly inconvenient and vexatious. A contingent purchaser, having a direct interest in depreciating the property which he will hereafter buy, is the worst possible adviser of the actual owner.

Some of the Local Government Acts confer on governing bodies a portion of the powers which Mr. LEEMAN's Bill proposes to confirm and extend; but, except as precedents for more general legislation, the enactments have little practical value. A provision requiring the sanction of a certain number or proportion of ratepayers assembled in public meeting will probably be transferred into any enabling Act which the Corporations may succeed in obtaining. As municipal representatives are elected annually by the whole body of ratepayers, it would seem reasonable that they should be supposed to express the wishes and opinions of their constituents; but the restriction, if it is unnecessary, will do little harm. No Corporation is likely to promote a Bill which is not at the time popular; and if a municipal decision is capriciously overruled, the worst result is that all things remain as they were. A wider discretion might fairly be allowed in opposing Bills promoted by other parties. It is desirable that every Bill which affects the welfare of a town should be watched in the interest of the community; and it is unfair to impose the burden on the most public-spirited section of the inhabitants. It often happens that a deviation in the line of a proposed railway, or the selection of a more convenient site for a station, would be generally beneficial; and if the ruling body is not allowed to interfere, the public interest may be seriously compromised. It is true that the exceptional privilege enjoyed by the Metropolitan Board of Works is sometimes abused in the form of officious interference; but, on a balance of evils, it is better that representative bodies should be liable to error than that they should be incapable of performing their proper functions. Provincial Corporations have local knowledge and local sympathies which are not to be found in London Vestries, nor even in the central Board. Considering the character of the municipal constituencies, it is surprising that the Corporations have even attained their moderate standard of excellence. Fortunately they are for the most part governed by their Town Clerks, who are permanent officers, and in many instances men of considerable ability. The defects of elected administrative bodies are to a great extent corrected by their incapacity to discharge their most important duties except through professional agents. The Metropolitan Board of Works is not a wise or enlightened body, but it has performed through its engineers the two great achievements of the drainage of London and the construction of the Thames



Embankment. The management of gas and water undertakings by Corporations would be inefficient and corrupt if it were not really dependent on the honesty and ability of engineers, of managers, of secretaries, and of lawyers. Mayors and Town Councillors sometimes learn from their officers how to conduct public business, and at the worst they find themselves beneficially hampered by rules, by traditions, and by the influence of permanent officials. To a certain extent Corporations may be elevated in character by the possession of enlarged rights and by the obligation of important duties.

#### THE ELTHAM MURDER AND THE POLICE.

IT is impossible to exaggerate the disquietude which has been produced by the conduct of the police in reference to the Eltham murder. They have failed, so far as we know, to find any clue to the right man, and they have expended a vast amount of labour in endeavouring to obtain a conviction against the wrong man. This case began when the case of the men in women's clothes was near its end, and the two cases have combined to show that the intervention of the Treasury in criminal business is certain to produce disastrous failure. The holding of protracted investigations before magistrates has inevitably the effect of advertising that witnesses are wanted to complete the case for the prosecution, and demand produces supply in perjury as well as in other articles of commerce. In civil cases this is notoriously true. When the person who witnessed a street collision on a particular day is requested by advertisement to call upon an attorney, the invitation is usually responded to. Between the risk of being murdered, and the risk of being hanged for a murder which somebody else committed, the metropolis is becoming a very unsafe place. One might so regulate one's haunts and habits as to be tolerably secure against violent assault, but respectability of life can be no protection from suspicion by the police, who may perhaps choose to apply to one's case the theory that still waters run deep.

On the morning of Wednesday, the 26th of April last, a young woman was found by a policeman in Kidbrook Lane, near Greenwich, lying on the ground terribly injured, but not dead. She died a few days afterwards, and the police endeavoured to discover the perpetrator of the murder, which had thus become complete. She was found to be with child, and she had lived until recently as servant in the house of Mr. Pook, printer, of Greenwich, who had an unmarried son. The police adopted that which probably appeared to them the natural conclusion under the circumstances, that this son had first seduced the girl, and then murdered her. When they inquired how this young man, EDMUND WALTER POOK, had spent his time, they encountered the difficulty that, if he committed the murder, it must have been committed before nine o'clock on Tuesday evening. Now the policeman who found the injured woman stated that he passed through the lane about a quarter before two o'clock on Wednesday morning, but nothing attracted his attention, and he passed along the lane again about a quarter after four o'clock, but did not notice anything unusual. As he returned, he found the woman on her hands and knees on the right-hand side of the lane, moaning, and saying, "Oh, my poor head!" Thus he had passed the spot twice before he found the woman, and he heard nothing on either occasion. The officers MULVANY and GRIFFIN, who have gained a certain sort of celebrity by this case, arrived on the 1st of May at the conclusion that they ought to suspect young Pook of this murder, and accordingly they went to his father's house, where, after many questions, which he appears to have answered satisfactorily, they took him into custody. They then proceeded, according to the usual practice, to get up a case against him. We do not, of course, for a moment assume that they had any malice towards Pook; but here was an atrocious murder committed close to Greenwich, for which somebody must be punished, and Pook offered himself conveniently. His clothes were carried away by these officers and submitted to scientific examination, which discovered on the leg of the trousers a single hair, which, being six or seven inches long, was presumed to have belonged to a woman. There were also some spots of blood upon the trousers and upon the right wristband of the shirt, which Pook produced as having been worn by him on the evening of the 25th April. It appears in the highest degree improbable that, if Pook had committed the violent attack of which the woman died, there would have been no more traces of blood remaining upon his clothes than those which were discovered by the police. And these spots and the single hair found on the sixth day after the murder were the whole of

the materials with which the police began to construct their case. A plasterer's hammer, with blood upon it, was found near the scene of the murder, and a surgeon stated that the wounds of which the woman died might have been inflicted by such a weapon. Evidence was offered at the trial that Pook had bought such a hammer in Deptford on the evening before the murder; and as the jury acquitted Pook, it is certain that they did not believe this evidence. The police announced in the usual way that they wanted witnesses, and they got them. Now it is, of course, conceivable that a murder might be committed with such a weapon; but if a man were preparing twenty-four hours in advance to murder a girl whom he had seduced, it is very unlikely that he, being a printer, would provide himself with a plasterer's hammer for the purpose. It would probably occur to him that he might as well do the work neatly if he did it at all. However, a witness came forward to swear that he saw Pook go into an ironmonger's shop, and saw a woman who served in the shop reaching a hammer from the window. This witness first appeared on the 3rd or 4th of June, after the investigation had been a month in progress. His attempt to supply the missing link in the chain of proof was not, however, successful with the jury.

The discovery of this evidence after the police had had the case in hand a month is exactly the sort of result which we, observing their proceedings at the time, expected from them. If, however, particular officers have displayed an eagerness to convict Pook which demands special reprehension, our present object is to censure not so much the men as the system on which they work. English criminal procedure, which is in many respects admirable, is often complacently assumed by Englishmen to afford a model for the imitation of the world. It may, indeed, be allowed that the defects which have lately been conspicuously manifested originate in that practice of publicity which, within proper limits, is in the highest degree valuable. It is quite right that investigations should be held in open Court; but if there is nothing to investigate, the police might usefully wait until there is. We can hardly recognise the necessity of supplying the newspapers with a sensation as a sufficient reason for these proceedings against Pook. It may have been proper, on the statement which the deceased girl was reported to have made, to search Pook's residence and submit his clothing to scientific examination. But there the proceedings against him ought to have stopped. If the officers who call themselves detectives deserve the name, they would be capable of watching Pook for a year without his being aware of it; and if he departed from his home in attempted secrecy, he would thus afford an indication of guilt which might be safely trusted. It is difficult to believe that, if the police had not started so eagerly on the track of Pook, they might not have found some clue which better deserved to be diligently pursued. The statement which the girl was reported to have made might be either truth or a form of falsehood which would occur readily to her mind. If she had lived and had some months afterwards sworn that Pook was the father of the child of which she was at the time of her death pregnant, he might, like many other men, have found the allegation difficult to repel. But it was an exceptionally hard fate to be accused on a bare report of the girl's words, not only of seduction, but of murder. We cannot help remarking that the same thing might happen, and perhaps sometimes does happen, to a man whose friends may not be able to engage an attorney and four counsel to defend him. Dwellers in the metropolitan district enjoy the protection of its police while they do well, with the qualification, however, that they may be brutally murdered in any lane where a policeman does not happen on a particular night to pass. But if they do, or are suspected to have done, ill, they may see the whole power of the Crown lawyers exerted to prove that they have committed murder. A single hair, supposed to be a woman's, may be strong enough to hang a man. The plea of SHAKESPEARE'S clown, "I was taken with none, sir; I was taken with a demoiselle," would avail nothing with those vigilant guardians of public morality, Inspector MULVANY and Superintendent GRIFFIN. A woman has been murdered almost under the very noses of these officers, and they cannot allow it to be supposed that they are unable to detect the murderer. If the girl had lived, and had a child, and had sworn it, as they say, to Pook, every police officer in the kingdom would have believed her. And when the girl is murdered, it is natural to suppose that he who would have been the father of the child has taken this means of preventing its entrance into the world. Thus the case against Pook is started, and it is completed in the way we have already seen. It is then put into a brief and passes into the hands of counsel for the Crown, who of course conduct

the prosecution with scrupulous fairness and anxiety to avoid undue pressure against the prisoner at the bar. Luckily for him, however, he is not obliged to trust entirely to the forbearance of the Crown lawyers, which, we may remark by the way, does not usually display itself until the case comes before a Judge, who would be apt to check them if they went too far. In getting up the case for Court, the police appear to direct the lawyers instead of the lawyers directing them. They take a man into custody, and then proceed to make out a case against him, and their efforts in this direction are sometimes manifestly ill-directed and unskilful. It would have been improper to say this while the case of Pook was under preliminary investigation, but we ought to say so now that the case is over, and before it is forgotten.

#### LEISURE.

WITH Londoners, if not with Englishmen generally, the art of wisely and profitably spending leisure time is rapidly becoming extinct. The commodity itself is, under the pressure of competition, with equal rapidity becoming more and more difficult to obtain. Work, which begins by being a necessity, in the case of those who are conscious of a capacity for it, grows into a passion, and so is apt to encroach on our hours of relaxation and to unfit us for using them; our leisure, in fact, becomes work only under slightly altered conditions. Society is probably the better for this energy; but the individual sufferers are not few, and the necessity of making breaks in our work and of using them aright becomes more imperative every year. In spite of the way in which brains and bodily strength are taxed, we suppose that some degree of leisure is within the reach of all persons, with perhaps the solitary exception of rural labourers; and even to the poor clowns who in the long summer days rise with the sun and labour after it has set there come periods of enforced leisure, when they contemplate the snow or the frost or the rain, which offer them the alternative of an interview with the Board of Guardians or starvation. But let the hours of work be ever so long, there must be, to most persons, some scraps of time beyond what is required for food and sleep, and the question is how these can be utilized. The increase of wealth without a corresponding increase of refinement has done much to complicate the question and to "animalize" our leisure. The way in which a busy man spends his evenings is no bad test of his mental organization. The non-literary man professes himself too weary to look at any but the very lightest fiction; while a man of education makes even his amusements tend indirectly to his further cultivation, and finds more pleasure in keeping up his acquaintance with the books which he studied when at the University than an ignorant person derives from the most sensational novel. In the one case the work of education is continued not only without effort but with absolute pleasure, in the other case the mental appetite is debased and made less capable of assimilating wholesome food. Those whose evil fortune it has been rapidly to accumulate large fortunes discover that long evenings can be most pleasantly spent by giving costly entertainments, with wines of rare vintage and of fabulous price, to persons of their own stamp, with whom they can discuss that choicest of all literature, whether ancient or modern, the Money Article in the *Times*. Such persons are to be pitied, for, with all the power that wealth can give, they see no return for their money except vast houses, gorgeous furniture, and unwholesome food. The abuse which holidays suffer from ignorant people is also evident from the way in which the poorer classes enjoy themselves when released from work. With them to be idle is ample gratification; to the sights and sounds so dear to others they are superior; the bar of a filthy public-house, the lounge at the corner of the street, affords ample scope for their simple pleasures. Now and then they will make an excursion into the country or to the seaside, but we question whether the journey presents any attractions beyond the opportunities of visiting strange taverns and making trial of strange liquors. The vans which are much affected on these occasions, although as means of locomotion they are neither rapid nor satisfactory, have the great advantage of being able to stop at as many inns on the roadside as may appear to be attractive; and if on occasions the train which offers nine hours at the seaside for half-a-crown is patronized, we may be sure that this disadvantage is keenly felt and atoned for as soon as the journey is over. Neither sands nor seas have charms; they are well enough as fresh scenes in which bad tobacco may be smoked and beer may be drunk, but against the refining influences which nature exercises over gentler beings our excursionists are proof. Looking for a moment at another class of persons, we are obliged to confess that the good intentions which founded literary societies and mechanics' institutes have been frustrated. Just as the managers of the Crystal Palace find that displays of fireworks and facilities for dancing are its greatest attractions, and that the opportunities which it presents for studying geology, ethnology, and other sciences are rarely, if ever, embraced—just as at the South Kensington Museum pictures or jewels or furniture make the strollers through that building look for a brief space less bored than usual, while a neat array of bottles, in which the several component parts of the human frame, each in exact quantity and in its own separate bottle, are set forth with accompanying and

explanatory diagrams, is regarded as a good joke rather than a serious lesson in chemistry—so literary institutions which started with the highest professions and on principles of extreme devotion to science have had to subside into concerts disguised as musical lectures, and to become mere debating societies. We doubt whether any people make a better use of the Saturday half-holiday or of the after-business hours than the shopmen or workmen of large firms whose heads take an intelligent interest in the subject. The cricket-field and the river, which are within a Londoner's reach on a summer afternoon, the library and the reading-room, which are available at other times, are institutions firmly established and highly valued in those large London houses of business whose inmates exceed in number the population of some rural villages. Besides these there are doubtless numbers of hardworked men who use their leisure hours wisely and profitably, and who go back to their chambers or their offices or the Exchange refreshed and invigorated in mind and body.

If it be true that these scraps of time, the *hora subseciva*, which come to us daily, are by the majority of persons but indifferently used, chiefly perhaps because they come to us in doses so infinitesimal that they seem to be not worth caring for, we think that our remarks will equally apply to those periods which vary in duration from a few days to some months, and which we call our holidays. We are writing now within view of the time when London begins to empty itself, and when all its residents who can do so, from peers to costermongers, seek change of air and scene. In London at least the annual holiday is now regarded not as a luxury, but as a necessity, and indeed we can only think of one class of persons, who have to earn their bread, to whom a holiday long enough to be a real break in the chain of work is not a necessity. The persons whom we would except are those who, by an abuse of the English language, are called "working men," and who, as a matter of fact, get more holidays than any other people with whom we are acquainted. Their religious convictions keep them from work for some ten days after the festivals of Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide; and the faithful observance of their Sunday duties—all the more irksome from the circumstance that an objection to the Prayer Book, or to the Bible, or to the clergy, or to religion generally, prevents them from attending any public place of worship—lays on them the necessity of doing no work on Mondays, while on occasions their Sabbath lasts into the middle of the week. With this exception we regard holidays as a matter of universal necessity in these days, and in the higher classes, if indeed we may speak of any class as superior to those who frighten successive Governments at home, and have a policy for every foreign Power, we think that holidays are frequently abused, although after a different fashion. The energy which has accomplished a year of successful work is often extended into our holidays. To "do" Canada and some of the Northern States in six weeks, grudging the time of inaction necessarily devoted to the voyage to and fro, is a laborious process, which the excitement of new scenes may temper, but can never make beneficial to jaded frames and weary brains. There are more desirable things to be accomplished in a holiday than to sight Mont Blanc in the shortest number of hours after leaving Charing Cross, or to have gone over the greatest space in a given time. What over-worked men require is simply recreation or relaxation in the literal sense of the words; for the first few days of a holiday, existence should be a negative thing; it takes at least that time to get rid of the accumulated worries of work; but, by adding no fresh subjects of thought, by eschewing letters and, if possible, newspapers, by lying idly on the grass and leading the life of a mollusc or a lotus-eater, the "cares which infest the day" will depart and leave the mind comparatively a blank. Once in a way this is a very desirable condition, a worthy object of a sensible man's effort; it will not last long; nature will soon reassert herself, and life will become a positive thing again.

Much of the success of a holiday depends on the place in which we spend it. The fortunate few who are born to landed estates naturally fly to their own domains, where, however they may have been wearied by the business of Parliament and other cares, they find, if not absolute leisure, yet a change of occupation so complete as to be the next best thing to idleness. But all are not so blessed; we cannot all have our yachts waiting for us and ready to carry us beyond the reach of familiar faces and the influence of familiar scenes; a Scotch moor is beyond the resources of many of Her Majesty's subjects; and, in fact, many very useful and intelligent members of society are absolutely without lands of their own on which they can keep their holiday. Such persons have some compensation; they have the privilege of choosing for themselves, and are free from the painful necessity of visiting paternal acres which may happen to be in the fens or in the black country, or to have a clay soil; they have also the power of varying the scene of their holiday year by year. No doubt the mere change of surroundings, the sound of a different language, the sight of costumes different from those which meet us daily at home, and, still more, a change of food and of cookery, give many advantages to a Continental tour. There are still, however, parts of England which offer scenery unrivalled of its kind, where inn-keepers are still unspoiled, and where the curse of German bands and organs is comparatively unknown. The site, after all, is not the chief consideration; if in any healthy place people will have strength of mind to conquer their anxiety to see the *Times* at breakfast, and to sever themselves from the people with whom they mix daily when at home, they are likely to make an entirely wise use of their holiday.



Our doctrine, in brief, is that laziness is, at certain times and under given circumstances, a good and useful thing—that *vacare in loco* is not only pleasant but a necessary duty—a thing to be aimed at sedulously and to be cultivated for its own sake. Brain and nerve and sinew have no easy time in the present busy age, and if the bow were now and then more completely unstrung, instead of being only somewhat loosened, we should hear of fewer of those cases of utter prostration of mental and bodily powers which now come upon us with unpleasant frequency. The hive will never be without drones; the world will always have its proportion of idlers; in our London world, just now at all events, the tendency is to aim at accomplishing too much. To rest is often a wise economy of time, although it may demand a greater sacrifice of inclination than to go on working while others are working, and, as it seems, are likely to pass us in the race.

#### THE CONTAGIOUS DISEASES ACTS.

THE Royal Commission on the Contagious Diseases Acts has published a Report, demonstrating the extremely beneficial operation of those enactments, and recommending that they should be partially repealed. The conclusion is obviously at variance with the premises, but it is avowedly a compromise, and the Report explains very distinctly the way in which it has been arrived at. The attention of the Government having been drawn to the terrible ravages of an insidious and virulent disease among the men of the army and navy, an Act was passed in 1864 providing for the surgical examination of notorious women who were supposed to be infected, and for their detention in certified hospitals during a limited period. The operation of this measure was confined to eleven military stations, garrisons, and seaport towns. In 1866, on the suggestion of a Committee of eminent surgeons, an amended Act was passed, directing the periodical examination of women in the prescribed districts, either on a magistrate's order or by voluntary submission, and the detention in hospital of those who were found to be diseased for a period not exceeding three, or, under special circumstances, six months. The result of subsequent inquiries by Committees of both Houses of Parliament was the passing of a third Act in 1869, enlarging some of the provisions of the statute of 1866, and extending its operation to eighteen places in England and Ireland. The Acts of 1866 and 1869 are those now in force, and the reason why they were substituted for the original Act of 1864 was that the latter did not place the women under sufficient restraint. It subjected them to medical treatment only in a casual and fitful manner, and allowed them to go away before they were properly cured. The arrival of a regiment or a ship would empty the wards. If it was right that they should be placed under compulsory treatment, it was obviously necessary that they should be kept under treatment until it had produced a satisfactory effect; and it was equally necessary to guard against a relapse or a renewal of disease, and to render the operation of the law as uniform and complete as possible. Hence the periodical inspection insisted upon by the Medical Committee, and approved by Committees of the two Houses, as well as by successive Governments. It is the decided and unanimous opinion of the medical officers of the army and navy that these Acts have had a beneficial influence on the health of the men. Among the witnesses summoned at the instance of the Association for the Repeal of the Acts there was not a single medical officer of either service. In other words, all those who have had the best opportunities of observing the actual working and estimating the results of the Acts, and who have the strongest and most direct interest in preserving the health of the men, are favourable to the law. Dr. Balfour, the Inspector-General of the Army Medical Department, who was formerly very much opposed to periodical examination, now testifies to its advantageous effect, and regards it as indispensable to the efficiency of the system.

So much for the result of the Acts as regards the soldiers and sailors; as regards the unfortunate women themselves, their operation has been equally beneficial. The number of prostitutes has been sensibly reduced, while at the same time there is a marked improvement in the health, demeanour, and general condition of those who remain. The evidence taken by the Commissioners satisfied them that the Acts have, both directly and indirectly, promoted the objects of sanitary and municipal reform. "They have purged the towns and encampments to which they have been applied of miserable creatures who were masses of rottenness and vehicles of disease, providing them with asylums where their sufferings could be temporarily relieved, even if their malady was beyond cure; and where their better nature was probably for the first time touched by human sympathy." A chaplain is attached to each of the certified hospitals, and the matrons also exercise a wholesome influence on the poor creatures submitted to their care, at a time when they are doubtless more susceptible to such influences than at any other. Of 9,688 women who have been registered since the Acts came into operation in the several districts, 7,038 have been removed from the register for various causes, many of them having been restored to their friends, or otherwise induced to quit their evil life. Even if this were doubtful, the absence of public solicitation is a material gain to public decency and morality. Making every allowance for duplicate registrations, the Commissioners are convinced that "the number of women reclaimed,

directly or indirectly, by the operation of the Acts, must be considerable." Nor is this all. While a large number of women have thus been withdrawn from systematic and professional vice, the Acts have also had a strong deterring influence in regard to clandestine immorality. The Commissioners were assured by witnesses who spoke from personal knowledge, that not only young girls, but married women, seamstresses, and others were restrained from indulging in occasional license through fear of being brought within the scope of the Acts. Moreover, the removal of women from a vicious course of life in a great many cases implies the probable salvation of their unhappy offspring. Inspector Amis, of the Devonport district, calculates that the reduction of notorious women from about 2,000 (every one of whom he has registered by name) to less than 600, involves the disappearance from infamous houses and streets of some 200 or 300 children of from thirteen to fifteen years of age.

This is the account which the Commissioners give of the working of the Acts, and as nearly as possible in their own words. All the medical witnesses engaged in the administration of the Acts concur in representing the periodical examination as essential to their efficiency; and the Commissioners themselves are satisfied that this is the most efficacious means of controlling disease. Indeed they acknowledge that, as a mere physical question, they would desire not only to keep the Acts as they are, but to extend their operation to all large towns. The examination being the most effective means of coping with disease, it follows that, if it is abolished, as the Commissioners recommend, disease may be expected to increase. The Commissioners assure us that it is solely on moral grounds that they propose that greater facilities should be afforded for the propagation of a loathsome and horrible pestilence, which, to use their own words, is not, like other contagions, of occasional occurrence, but of perennial growth, and the ravages of which are scarcely less formidable than those of the small-pox in its worst days, and extend to the innocent as well as the guilty. What, then, are these moral grounds? We have seen that the Commissioners fully admit the gain to morality through the reduction in numbers and the improvement in decorum and demeanour of notorious women, the removal of children and young girls from evil haunts and contaminating associations, and the general deterrent influence of the Acts. Moreover, they hold that "special regulations for the treatment and control of a class of persons frequenting certain districts under conditions calculated to engender and propagate disease are alike just and expedient," and they see no moral grounds on which such regulations can be opposed. There are no moral reasons against the Act of 1864, which provides for the cure of disease imperfectly, but only against the Acts of 1866 and 1869, which deal with it effectually and successfully.

The Commissioners, to do them justice, give no countenance to the monstrous theory that disease should be allowed free scope as a punishment on licentious persons; and they decline to decide the question of the moral effect of periodical examinations upon the women themselves. Apparently it is not the "moral sense" of the women which is outraged, since it is stated in the Report that a large proportion of them appreciate the benefit of a vigilant watch over their health; and the proposal to go back to the Act of 1864 is expressly based on the assumption that they may be trusted to avail themselves of the system of their own accord when they understand it properly. Whose moral sense, then, is it that is offended by the existence of effectual precautions against disease? The Commissioners do not tell us. They merely say that due attention must be paid to "the sentiment of the people with regard to prostitution." We are left to infer that the "sentiment of the people" is opposed to the periodical examination of diseased women, since it is recommended that the examination should be given up. But this only starts another inquiry. Who are the people? The only people we are aware of who really object to this examination are the clique of noisy perambulating agitators composing the Association for the repeal of the Acts; and as they denounce all interference with the free propagation of pestilence and the sacred right of unrestricted prostitution, it is obvious that their "sentiment" will not be satisfied with anything short of the entire abolition of the system in every form. It is true that the Association has contrived, by the circulation of a variety of falsehoods, to create a prejudice against the Acts in some parts of the country; but it may be presumed that this prejudice will be dissipated by the exposure of the foolish gossip and malicious inventions on which it rested. Most of the inflammatory statements made at the meetings and in the publications of the Association were, the Commissioners assure us, perversions of the truth as far as they had any foundation whatever. The alleged cases of insult to innocent women, and torture of the poor creatures who came lawfully under the Acts, have all broken down upon investigation. In some instances the persons who made those statements, when challenged to prove them, refused to come forward; in others, "the explanations have been hearsay, or more or less frivolous." The Commissioners exonerate the police from all charges of having abused their authority, and report that they have discharged a novel and difficult duty with moderation and caution.

The state of the case then is simply this. The Commissioners were appointed to report upon the administration and operation of the Acts. They find that they have been administered with moderation and tenderness, and that their operation has been decidedly beneficial, both physically and morally. But there are some things about them which are supposed to offend "the senti-

ment of the people," and as it is assumed to be impracticable to extend them in their present form to the country at large, and illogical to limit them to certain places, it is recommended that the effectual system now in force should be abandoned, and the ineffectual and imperfect system of 1864 revived. The Report shows that the "sentiment" opposed to the Acts is contradicted by results, and is in a great degree based on absolute falsehoods. The Commissioners do not justify the sentiment; they merely report that they think it exists, and on that point their opinion is worth neither more nor less than that of anybody else. The truth is, the whole of the opposition to the Acts has been artificially organized by the noisy club of shrieking sisters and canting brethren who circulated the disgraceful falsehoods which have now been so authoritatively exposed and rebuked. There was no resistance to them when they were first passed, the women who were directly concerned readily fell in with the new arrangements, and, as far as they attracted public notice, the Acts were favourably received. Indeed proposals were made in various large towns for a general extension of the law. It was felt that the subject was a very painful and unpleasant one, and there was a natural repugnance to say much about it. The modest reticence of the supporters of the Acts has given their antagonists who despised such restraints a great advantage in the controversy which was suddenly commenced the year before last. We observe that the opponents of the law are changing their tactics; one of the organs of their party now deprecates discussion, and suggests that the Acts had better be repealed in solemn silence. We admit the desirableness of putting an end to all public controversy on an unsavoury and disgusting question, though we demur to the proposed method of accomplishing it. The responsibility of forcing these offensive questions into general notice rests with the Association for the repeal of the Acts, which has taken a morbid delight in dilating on the most revolting aspects of the subject. While professing to protect virtue, the agitators have in fact been doing battle on behalf of the freedom of vice. In one of the memorials against the Acts, signed by "F. W. Newman," the unrestricted freedom of prostitution is justified on commercial grounds. To shut up a diseased street-walker in a hospital until she is cured would be "to change the whole structure and arrangement of her life; the relations she may have formed would be abruptly ended; milliners, dressmakers, seamstresses, domestic servants, &c., who eke out a precarious existence, or provide themselves with coveted luxuries in the form of dress, &c., by recourse to occasional prostitution, would at once lose their business connexions, or, if in situations, would be discharged." It is justly remarked by the Commissioners that one of the best apologies for the Acts is that they tend to deter women thus hovering on the brink of systematic and professional vice from yielding to temptation. It is unfortunate that chastity cannot be enforced, but it is at least prudent and humane to check the ravages of a horrible disease from which the innocent and guilty suffer alike. The extension of the provisions of the Act of 1864 to our large towns generally would be doubtless an advantage in itself; but at all events this is scarcely the moment when we can afford to waste any of the valuable materials of which our army and navy are composed in deference to silly cant and hysterical clap-trap. The intemperate and insolent demeanour of the deputations which went to browbeat Mr. Bruce on Thursday at the Home Office is sufficient evidence of the hopelessness of conciliating the fanatical opponents of the Acts by any concessions. The sanitary benefits of the system will be impaired by a return to the Act of 1864, while the pretexes for sentimental vituperation will still remain. As immediate legislation is impracticable, agitation is to be organised for the suspension of the Acts, and the menaces of the Association are certainly alarming. Dr. Guthrie acknowledges that he is himself "horried at the literature which Christian men and women would feel it their duty to scatter broadcast" in order to excite public opinion. We have had a foretaste of the wanton nastiness and reckless falsehood in which "Christian men and women" are not ashamed to indulge; but this only renders it more necessary that so unscrupulous and disgraceful an agitation should be firmly resisted.

#### DECAYED BOROUGHES.

IN times past the phrase of "rotten boroughs" used to be a favourite weapon of political controversy. If we have not ventured to put the ancient formula at the head of this article, it is out of deference to the prejudices of our readers. They may by this time shrink from the phrase which used to be so stirring, as we believe that the adjective "rotten"—except when it happens to be followed by the substantive "Row"—is one of those words which are beginning to be thought unseemly, and to stand in some need of a euphemism. But, besides this, it is not political rottenness in itself of which we now wish to speak, except so far as it has to do with outward historical and physical rottenness. Boroughs politically rotten, boroughs whose rottenness has brought on them the punishment of political extinction, have still been living and even flourishing habitations of men. Bridgewater is a busy place, and Great Yarmouth is a busier, and even St. Albans is not altogether a howling wilderness. We wish to speak rather of certain spots, once Parliamentary boroughs, which have well nigh ceased to be habitations of men at all. Rotten at one time politically, they are moreover "decayed" physically. In some, indeed, decay

has reached the full stage of physical as well as political extinction.

The boroughs whose political life has been put an end to by our successive Reform Bills naturally fall into two or three classes. When it is clear that a town does not possess that degree of relative importance in the general aspect of the country which gives it a fair right to Parliamentary representatives of its own, it is not a matter of practical consequence how it came about that the place should enjoy a political weight beyond its due. If it is for the public good that the place should be disfranchised, or shorn of a member, or united to some other borough, it must be so dealt with, whatever were the causes which brought it into such a plight. But the historical investigation of those causes is often curious and instructive, and they are widely different in different cases. The rottenness of some boroughs was an incidental misfortune: the rottenness of others was the law of their nature. We might add that the rottenness itself was of two kinds; there was the rottenness of bribery and the rottenness of influence. There was the rottenness of those boroughs where electors, free to use their votes as they chose, chose to sell them for money. And there was the rottenness of those boroughs whose electors never thought of selling their votes for money, because they knew that their votes were not their own to sell. It is among this last class that we have to look for our boroughs which are not only politically rotten but physically decayed, and the various causes of their decay are well worth studying and comparing with one another.

First of all there is a wide distinction between those boroughs which, when they were first called upon to return members, had a fair claim to do so, and those which seem to have been rotten from the beginning, and which were enfranchised simply in order that they might be corrupt. The Parliamentary existence of the first class commonly dates from the thirteenth century, that of the second class from the sixteenth. We may be sure that neither Earl Simon nor King Edward summoned members from any particular borough with any underhand views as to the way in which the Parliamentary franchise would work in that borough. To say nothing of the character of the two men, such designs are quite foreign to their times and their position. The beginnings of all institutions are commonly honest; it is only at a later stage that ingenious men find out that it is possible to work them corruptly for their own ends. If there was any dishonest dealing in early times, it was on the part of local officers, not of the general government. The Sheriff of each county had to cause two citizens or burgesses to be chosen by each city or borough in his county, and he seems to have had a good deal of license as to the places to be understood by the name of cities or boroughs. In the days of our early Parliaments, the places which sent members to one Parliament were by no means always the same as those which sent members to the next. We know enough of the matter to see that, in days when constituencies paid their representatives, some towns looked on representation simply as a burden, while others had sense enough from the beginning to see that it was a privilege. In such a state of things the *favor Vicecomitis* went for something, and we find one place taken and another left, according to what, at our distance of time, seems no certain rule. But on the whole we may say that the places which were summoned to send members to our earliest Parliaments were places which at the time had a fair right to be summoned. That all alike, great and small, sent two members is in no way wonderful. The notion of apportioning members to population is the subtlety of a far later age; indeed, the real reason for sending two members seems to have been that each might act as a check upon his fellow, and hinder him for voting contrary to the interests and wishes of their common constituents. As long as the Commons were young and weak, as long as the King could safely refuse the wishes of his people, he had no mind or motive to seek to hinder the people from freely telling him what their wishes really were. It was when Parliaments came to be at once powerful and subservient, when each member began to be a person of importance, that the days of influence and management began. In the days of Henry the Eighth we find a system of Government interference with Parliamentary elections almost as carefully organized as it was under the late state of things in France. Later on in the Tudor period we find places called on to send members which, if they had ever been of any importance, had certainly ceased to be so then, and which we must conceive to have been enfranchised simply that they might send members who were likely to be under the influence of the Court, or of persons on whom the Court could rely. In the case of the older boroughs, a good many of them were rightly swept away by the first Reform Bill, but we can commonly see by what causes it came about that their disfranchisement was a matter of justice. We have pointed out before now that in France the towns which are of importance now have mostly been of importance from the beginning, while in England matters have for the most part run an opposite course. London alone has kept the place which was won for it by the heroism of its citizens nine hundred years back. Everywhere else the towns which were of the first rank in early times have sunk into the second or third class, or even lower. Winchester, Exeter, Lincoln, Chester, York, even Bristol and Norwich, have all been utterly outstripped by younger rivals. No one would think of disfranchising any of these towns; still, among them all, Bristol is the only one which can assert the feeblest claim to rank now as a city of the first class. Most of them are positively far greater than they were anciently, but rela-



tively they have fallen back. In other cases, places which were once of great military or commercial importance have more than relatively gone back. In many cases they have positively decayed, in some cases they have been wholly forsaken; but the point is that they were places of real importance once, and that when they were first called upon to return members they were called upon to do so in perfect good faith.

The case is very different with the boroughs which were called on to return members for the first time in the sixteenth century. It can hardly be doubted that they were enfranchised expressly in order to be corrupt. When we find that places from which no one had thought of summoning members at any earlier time, and from which the right of sending members has been taken away in our own time, were first called on to send them in the days when the influence of the Crown was at its height, the presumption seems complete. The Tudor sovereigns fully understood the advantage of doing everything regularly by Parliamentary authority; they wished therefore to have Parliaments which would serve their own purposes, and one means of getting such Parliaments was to enfranchise boroughs which were pretty sure to send subservient members. It is at this time that many of those Cornish boroughs which were a byword at the time of the first Reform Bill first obtained Parliamentary representation. This fact is of itself enough to prove our case. There could not have been any honest motive for calling on such places to return burgesses. It does not at all follow that the members for Cornish or other rotten boroughs were always subservient. As the influence of the Crown lessened again, the choice of members for such places became a matter of private influence or of mere bargain and sale. The man who had bought his seat, whatever we may say of his position in other ways, was at all events independent of everybody.

We have been led into this train of thought by lately seeing a decayed borough of this class in its bodily presence. Such places are always curious sights. It is not perhaps fair to quote our old favourite Kenfig, because the Parliamentary rights of Kenfig are still untouched. For the same reason we ought perhaps not to mention Winchelsea, because, though it no longer returns distinct members of its own, it is included within the boundary of another borough. But Winchelsea is not the less, from the point of view of a municipal and Parliamentary antiquary, one of the most interesting places in England. The new town of Winchelsea, moved from its earlier site in the days of Edward the First, was meant to be a great borough and a great port, but it never became such. Kingston-on-Hull grew; Winchelsea did not. It is most striking to see the preparations which were made for what was to be; the walls which fence in nothing, the gates which lead to nothing, the large and splendid church begun but never finished, the streets laid out in regular order according to the plan always followed in the foundations of the great King, but streets which have never yet grown into the form of houses. The one thing which was finished, the Friars' church, is now a ruin; a country house with its usual appendages stands within the walls of the town, and all that has come of the great borough which was designed is a small village. Why Winchelsea should still form part of a Parliamentary borough is perhaps not very clear, but that it does so is not more wonderful than that large rural districts should be included within the boroughs of Cricklade, Shoreham, and elsewhere; but as it has lost its separate representation, we may perhaps venture to reckon it as one of the class with which we are dealing. Old Sarum, so long the byword of bywords, is an undoubted case. But there the difficulty is of another kind. When we look on the vast ditches of the primeval fortress, the ring within ring of the British Ekkatana, it is hard to carry ourselves back to times so recent as the thirteenth or even the eleventh century. The Briton has here outlived all his conquerors. The cathedral has altogether vanished; of the castle only a few stones are left. There is nothing to remind us that the elder Salisbury ever was a city—that from the days of William to those of Henry the Third it was at once a great military post and a seat of civil and ecclesiastical rule. The Parliamentary representation of Old Sarum must have been an anachronism from the beginning. It was doubtless called on to return members because it still retained the formal rank of a city. But its fall had begun before Earl Simon's Parliament met. The Church had already forsaken the place, and the new cathedral had arisen in the plain. In the course of the next century the ruin of Old Sarum seems to have been pretty well accomplished.

Old Sarum, then, is not so good a case of a decayed borough as some others, because there is nothing about it to remind us that it ever was a borough at all. A more speaking case will be found in a far obscurer spot, at the thoroughly decayed borough of Newtown in the Isle of Wight. It is the very model of utter decay—a decay made more suggestive by the seeming claim to newness in the name of the place. New College, the New Forest, and the Campanian Neapolis, if no longer what their names imply, are at least among existing things; but the Neapolis of Wight, while still calling itself new, has passed out of being altogether. There never was so clear a case of life in death. The old lines of street are to be seen keeping their old names, one of them, the Quay Street, keeping up the memory of the time when Newtown was a haven. But the streets are now green lanes, and the market square, still keeping its name, cannot even be called the village green, because it is a green without any village. The narrow strips of ground which formed the ancient burgh-tenures are still in many cases to be seen fringing the forsaken streets. How

many houses there may be besides the inevitable public and the Town Hall, which is now irreverently dwelled in, we do not accurately know, but we suspect that they might be counted on the fingers. Certainly, through all the streets and squares of Newtown we saw but a single inhabitant. He was but an old man driving a cow; still, as he was the only man whom we saw at all, our heated imagination at once clothed him with the dignity of Portreeve of the fallen commonwealth. But on more minute inquiries we found our mistake. Newtown never was so highly honoured. London once had her Portreeves, so had Yeovil; Kenfig and Langport have their Portreeves still. But Newtown never had anything better than a French Mayor; nay, the town itself once had a French name. The borough was incorporated in the days of Henry the Third by the King's half-brother, Aylmer, Bishop of Winchester, whose name, which had wandered so far from its Teutonic root, Englishmen seem to have pleased themselves by translating back again into Æthelmar. In his days the town was *Francheville*, and the name of Francheville may still be seen on the corporate seal, and the corporate seal may be seen, if nowhere else, as the sign of the local public. The town had charters from Edward the Second and Edward the Third, but the first and greatest of the name is not mentioned in connexion with Francheville. Yet one is strongly tempted to see his hand—the hand of the founder of more than one Francheville—in the regularly laid out streets, reminding us of Winchelsea and Libourne. Local history tells us that an attack in the French war ruined Francheville, or Newtown, that it never recovered the blow, and that the neighbouring town of Newport rose to prosperity on its downfall. And now here comes the fact which should be remembered; Francheville, or Newtown, never sent members to Parliament till long after the day of its ruin. The creation of Bishop Aylmer had no share in the national councils till the reign of Elizabeth. It is plain that the claim of Newtown to Parliamentary honours was that it had already sunk into decay.

#### VAGUE PEOPLE.

THE core of society is compact enough, made up as it is of those real doers of the world's work who are clear as to what they want, and who pursue a definite object with both meaning and method. But outside this solid nucleus lies a floating population of vague people; nebulous people; people without mental coherence or the power of intellectual growth; people without purpose, without aim, who drift with any current anywhere, making no attempt at conscious steering, and having no port to which they desire to steer; people who are emphatically loose in their mental hinges, and who cannot be trusted with any office requiring distinct perception or exact execution; people to whom existence is something to be got through with as little trouble and as much pleasure as may be, but who have not the faintest idea that life contains a principle which each man ought to make clear to himself and work out at any cost, and to which he ought to subordinate and harmonize all his faculties and his efforts. These vague people of nebulous minds compose the larger half of the world, and count for just so much dead weight, which impedes or gives its inert strength to the active agents as it chances to be handled. They are the majority which votes in committees and all assemblies as they are influenced by the one or two clear-minded leaders who know what they are about, and who drive them like sheep by the mere force of a definite idea and a resolute will.

Yet if there is nothing on which vague people are clear, and if they are not difficult to influence as the "majority," there is much on which they are positive as a matter of private conviction. In opposition to the exhortation to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us, they can give no reason for anything they believe, or fancy they believe. They are sure of the result, but the logical method by which that result has been reached is beyond their power to remember or understand. To argue with them is to spend labour and strength in vain, like trying to make ropes out of sea sand. Beaten off at every point, they settle down again into the old vague, vapoury *credo*, and it is like fighting with ghosts to attempt to convince them of a better way. They look at you helplessly, assent loosely to your propositions; but when you come to the necessary deduction, they double back in a vague assertion that they do not agree with you, they cannot prove you wrong, but they are sure that they are right; and you know then that the collapse is hopeless. If this meant tenacity, it would be so far respectable, even though the conviction were erroneous; but it is the mere unimpressible fluidity of vagueness, the impossibility of giving shape and coherence to a floating fog or a formless haze. Vague as to the basis of their beliefs, they are vaguer still as to their facts. These indeed are like a ladder of which half the rungs are missing. They never remember a story, and they cannot describe what they have seen. Of the first they are sure to lose the point and to entangle the thread; of the last they forget all the details, and confound both sequence and position. As to dates, they are as if lost in a wood when you require definite centuries, years, months; but they are great in the chronological generosity of "about," which is to them what the Middle Ages and Classic Times are to uncertain historians. It is as much as they can do to remember their own birthday; but they are never sure of their children's; and generally mix up names and ages in a manner that exasperates the young people like a personal insult.

With the best intentions in the world they do infinite mischief.

They detail what they think they have heard of their neighbours' sayings and doings; but as they never detail anything exactly, or twice alike, by the time they have told the story to half a dozen friends they have given currency to half a dozen different chimeras which never existed save in their own woolly imaginations. No repute is safe with them, even though they may be personally good-natured and anxious not to do anyone harm; but they are so vague that they are always setting afloat exaggerations which are substantially falsehoods; and if you tell them the most innocent fact of anyone you would not injure for worlds—say your own daughter or your dearest friend—they are sure to repeat it with additions and distortions, till they have made it into a Frankenstein, which no one now can subdue. Beside this mental haziness, which neither sees nor shapes a fact correctly, vague people are loose and unstable in their habits. They know nothing of punctuality at home or abroad; and you are never sure that you will not stumble on them at meal times at what time soever you may call. But worse than this, your own meal times, or any other times, are never safe from them. They float into your house uncertainly, vaguely, without purpose, with nothing to say and nothing to do, and for no reason that you can discover. And when they come they stay; and you cannot for the life of you find out what they want, or why they have come at all. They invade you at all times, in your busy hours, on your sacred days; and sit there in a chaotic kind of silence, or with vague talk that it tires your brains to bring to a focus; but they are too foggy to understand anything like a delicate hint, and if you want to get rid of them, you must risk a quarrel and effectively shoulder them out. They will be no loss. They are so much driftwood in your life, and you can make no good of them for yourself or others. Even when they undertake to help you, they do you more harm than good by the hazy way in which they understand, and the inexactness with which they carry out, your wishes. They volunteer to get you by favour the thing you want and cannot find in the general way of business—say, something of a peculiar shade of olive green—and they bring you in triumph a brilliant cobalt; they know the very animal you are looking for, they say, with a confidence that impresses you, and they send to your stable a grey horse to match your bay pony; and if you trust to their uncontrolled action in your affairs, you find yourself committed to responsibilities you cannot meet and brought to the verge of destruction. They do all this mischief, not for want of goodwill, but for want of definiteness of perception; and are as sorry as you are when they make "pie" and not a legible sheet. Their desire is good, but a vague desire to help is equal to no help at all; or even worse—it is a positive evil, and throws you wrong by just so much as it attempts to set you straight. They are as unsatisfactory if you try to help them. They are in evil case, and you are philanthropically anxious to assist them. You think that one vigorous push would lift the ear of their fortunes out of the rut in which it has stuck, and you go to them with the benevolent design of lending your shoulder as the lever. You question them as to the central fact which they wish changed; for you know that in most cases misfortunes crystallize round one such evil centre, which being removed the rest would go well. But your vague friends can tell you nothing. They point out this little superficial inconvenience, that small remediable annoyance, as the utmost they can do in the way of definiteness; but when you want to get to the core, you find nothing but a cloudy complaint of general ill-will, or a universal run of untoward circumstances with which you cannot grapple. To cut off the hydra's heads was difficult enough; but could even Hercules have decapitated the Djinn who rose in a volume of smoke from the fisherman's jar? It is the same in matters of health. Only medical men know to the full the difficulty of dealing with vague people when it is necessary that they should be precise. They can localize no pain, define no sensations; if the doctor thinks he has caught hold of one leading symptom, it fades away as he tries to examine it; and, probe as he may, he comes to nothing more definite than a pervading sense of discomfort, which he must resolve into its causes as he best can. So with their suspicions; and vague people are often strangely suspicious and distrustful. They tell you in a loose kind of way that such or such a man is a rogue, such or such a woman no better than she should be. You ask them for their data—they have none; you suggest that they are mistaken, or at least that they should hold themselves as mistaken until they can prove the contrary, and you offer your version of the reputations aspersed; your vague friends listen to you amiably, then go back on their charge, and say, "I am sure of it"—which ends the conversation. They rely on their impression, as other people rely on known facts, and a foggy belief is to them what a mathematical demonstration is to the exact.

In business matters they are simply maddening. They never have the necessary papers; they do not answer letters; they confuse your questions, and reply at random or not at all; and they forget all dates and details. When they go to their lawyer on business they leave certificates and drafts behind them locked up where no one can get at them; or if they send directions and the keys, they tell the servant to look for an oblong blue envelope in the right-hand drawer, when they ought to have said a square white parcel in the left. They give you vague commissions to execute; and you have to find your way in the fog to the best of your ability. They say they want something like something else you have never seen, and they cannot give an address more exact than "somewhere in Oxford Street." They think the man's name is Baker, or something like that. Perhaps

it is Flower; but the suggestion of ideas ought to be intelligible to you, and is quite near enough for them. They ask you to meet them when they come up to London, but they do not give you either the station or the train. You have to make a guess as near as you can, and when you reproach them, they pay you the compliment of saying you are so clever, it was not necessary for them to explain. If they have any friends out in Australia or India, they inquire of you, just returned, if you happened to meet them? When you ask where they were stationed, they say they do not know; and when you suggest that Madras and Calcutta are not in the same Presidencies, that India is a large place, and Australia not quite like an English county, they look helpless and bewildered, and drift away into the vague geography familiar to them, "somewhere in India," "somewhere in Australia," and "I thought you might have met them." For geography, like history, is one of the branches of the tree of knowledge they have never climbed, and of which the fruits are as though they were not. But apart from the personal discomforts to which vague people subject themselves, and the absurdities of which they are guilty, one cannot help speculating on the spiritual state of folks to whom nothing is precise, nothing definite, and no question of faith clearly thought out. To be sure they may be great in the realm of conviction; but so is the African savage when he hears the ghosts of his ancestors pass howling in the woods; so is the Assassin of the Mountain, when he sees heaven open as he throws himself on the spears of his enemies in an ecstasy of faith, to be realized by slaughter and suicide. Convictions based on imagination, unsupported by facts or proofs, are as worthless in a moral as in a logical point of view; but the vague have nothing better; and whether as politicians or as pietists, though they are warm partisans, they are but feeble advocates, fond of flourishing about large generalities, but impossible to pin to any point and unable to defend any position. To those who must have something absolute and precise, however limited—one inch of firmly-laid foundation on which to build up the remainder—it is a matter of more wonder than envy how the vague are content to live for ever in a haze which has no clearness of outline, no definiteness of detail, and how they can make themselves happy in a name, calling their fog faith, and therewith counting themselves blessed.

#### THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION.

THE London School Board has been confronted with its first real difficulty, and has decided to face it on the 25th of next October. We do not know whether the postponement of the discussion of the by-laws designed to make education compulsory is to be set down to the sudden heat of the weather, or to the disposition natural to characters of a certain type to put off troublesome business to the most distant date to which decency will allow it to be transferred. On the former supposition, a liberal application of ice might have enabled the Board to go on with its proper work, and it is to be regretted that no member of the minority had the presence of mind to suggest so simple and efficacious a remedy. A large refrigerator might have been introduced into the Board-room, and on the first symptoms of unusual languor on the part of any of the members, Mr. Lucraft, who seems to have been the most bent upon business, might have distributed the refreshing contents. The other hypothesis is not so easily dealt with. If the Board would refuse to work, there are clauses in the Education Act which might meet the case. But what is to be done with a Board which proclaims its readiness to do its work, and only asks that it shall not be made to keep its promise until the arrival of a more convenient season? The reason assigned by Dr. Rigg for leaving the subject alone until after the holidays is eminently inadequate. The 19th of July is not a date at which it is inflicting any unusual hardship on men of business to expect them to be still in London, and if several important members of the Board could not make it suit their convenience to attend any more meetings this summer, it would have been nothing more than they deserved if the most serious question which the Board will have to decide had been discussed and determined in their absence. As it is, the Board will have sat since last November without having taken up the subject which lies at the root of all educational progress. If they had omitted everything to which they have yet put their hands, and done this one thing instead, the cause of education would have greatly benefited. It may be of much moment to determine precisely what shall be taught in the Board schools, and to settle what subjects are to be reckoned essential and what discretionary. But it is of more moment still to ensure that a minimum knowledge of the essential subjects shall be communicated to every child in London. It is understood, says the *Daily News*, that from October 25 the Board will sit from day to day until the proposed by-laws have been fully debated. Why might not this economy of time have been resorted to sooner? A fortnight's continuous session would have got over a great deal of ground, and have done more to convince their constituents of the genuine zeal of the members for the cause of education than an unlimited succession of sensational Wednesdays. Yet if this continuous session had been extended to a month, it would have been over by August 15, and the members might have enjoyed their holidays with a comfortable sense of having got their business finished.

Only three members of the Committee appointed to consider



the compulsory clauses of the Education Act have signed the Report without qualification. Lord Sandon and Mr. W. H. Smith dissent from the definition of the term "school" as "either a public elementary school or any other school at which efficient public instruction is given." They would prefer to see complete freedom of choice allowed to the parents as to the schools to which they may send their children, and they think that this choice would generally be made "with a view to obtain the best and most suitable education in their judgment for their children in return for the sacrifices which the law calls upon them to make." This reasoning seems to us to be faulty on two grounds. In the first place, it attributes to the parents a soundness of judgment in educational matters which as yet it is highly unlikely they will possess in any considerable degree. Given that they will choose the school at which what they hold to be the "best and most suitable" education is to be had, they are sure to make very great mistakes. It has been shown that in Liverpool children are habitually sent, from various motives, to schools at which they learn absolutely nothing, rather than to schools charging a lower fee, or sometimes no fee at all, at which a good elementary education is really to be had. It is true that to secure "the regular attendance of the children of London at some school" would be "a change of enormous magnitude in the habits of the people of the metropolis"; but if it is not much more difficult to secure their attendance at an efficient school, it would be bad policy to rest content with the smaller success with the view of tackling the greater on to it at some future time. Besides this, the modification of the by-laws in the sense desired by Lord Sandon and Mr. Smith would make it very much more difficult for the Board to ensure regular attendance at any school. A certain section of parents, at all events, would choose a school not with a view to obtain the best and most suitable education for their children, but with a view to evading the law with the greatest impunity. It will be extremely hard, without the co-operation of the schoolmaster, to ensure regular attendance for the twenty-five hours a week insisted on by the proposed by-laws, or even for the ten hours weekly which the Committee propose to be content with in the case of any child between ten and thirteen "who shows to the satisfaction of the Board that he is beneficially and necessarily at work for the maintenance of himself or his parent;" and the teachers who are to be found in the lowest class of private schools are far more likely to assist the parent in making the by-laws of none effect than to assist the School Board in carrying out a system of compulsion.

Nine members of the Committee dissent from "so much of By-law No. 8 as would sanction the payment of fees in Denominational Schools." This question has been already discussed in these columns in connexion with the determination of the Liverpool School Board to take the same course as that recommended by the Committee of the London Board. We need only repeat here that an attempt to enforce compulsion on any other terms would make it so odious that it would be borne with but for a very short time. Take the case, for instance, of a Roman Catholic compelled to send his child to a Protestant school because he is too poor to pay the fees at a school of his own selection, and the Board will not pay them for him because the school to which he would like to send his children, though efficient in every respect, is denominational. The whole Roman Catholic body would at once be in arms against such tyranny, and they would find allies in every religious community which cares for distinctive religious teaching. If it is surprising that the secularist party in the London and other School Boards are unable to forecast so certain a future as this would become, provided they had their way as regards compulsion and denominational schools, it is even more wonderful that they do not see that the restriction they propose is dead against the spirit of the Education Act. The section which empowers the School Board to "pay the whole or any part of the school fees payable at any public elementary school," enacts positively that "no such payment shall be made or refused on condition of the child attending any public elementary school other than such as may be selected by the parent." If School Boards are not allowed to insist on a parent sending his child to some undenominational school selected by them as a condition of their paying the school fees, it would seem by parity of reasoning that they ought not to insist on his sending a child to an undenominational school maintained by them as a condition of their remitting the school fees.

The part of the Report which bears most traces of originality is that which treats of the machinery by which the Committee propose to carry out the by-laws. The whole of London is to be divided into districts, to each of which will be assigned a Visitor. It will be the duty of this Visitor to keep proper schedules of the children who ought to be attending school, to investigate applications made by parents for the remission or payment of school fees, and to report all cases of absence or irregularity on the part of the children which involve an infringement of the by-laws on the part of the parents. So far the recommendation has nothing distinctive about it. But the Committee go on to recommend that, as a general rule, these Visitors should be women, and, if possible, ladies, who have had experience in similar work. The chief part of the Visitor's duties, says the Report, "will consist in visiting the mothers of truant children, and in considering such excuses for non-attendance as want of clothes and other domestic difficulties which can be most fitly dealt with by women," while "the visits of a class of persons with whom the poor

are already familiar will be the least likely to excite resistance." This way of looking at the question seems to be entirely justified by experience, and the proposed plan will at all events have the advantage of disposing of sundry jokes about the police being employed to drag children to school. With a really judicious Visitor, the instances of obstinate resistance to the by-law will, we suspect, be extremely few. The only regret we feel in relation to this Report is that its suggestions cannot now be carried out until after Christmas, and consequently that at the very least half a year will be lost. The importance of these by-laws will become more and more apparent in proportion as the real educational wants of London are fully considered; and the more these wants are realized, the more inexplicable will be the conduct of the School Board in putting off for six months any serious effort to meet them.

#### ITALIAN CORRUPTION.

THE imputations lately thrown by General Trochu on "English luxury" were so lightly regarded as a censure (if indeed they were not accepted as a compliment) that it has seldom occurred to us to imagine that the correlative sneer at "Italian corruption" could excite much, if any, dissatisfaction among those whom it concerned. The fact, however, is that the Italians are exceedingly sore about it. The press has remonstrated in every tone, from that of playful irony to that of grave and serious indignation. But the anger and indignation of the press have been as nothing to the resentment felt and expressed by Italians in their own circles. Let a stranger but enter one of their Clubs and make even a guarded allusion to the French General's sneer, and he will forthwith let loose a torrent of invective. Putting aside all its other vices, its injustice, its cruelty, its malignity, it has this one great and preponderating sin—it is French. It proceeded from a native of that country which has alternately bullied and patronized Italy for the last eighty years, and which has been even less hateful in its bullying than in its patronage. It proceeded from an officer of that army which protected Rome against Italians, and which offended every class of the Italian people by its offensive condescension and its contemptuous insolence.

These antecedent conditions suffice to explain what has given peculiar force and venom to Trochu's words. Still, after admitting that the nationality of the accuser has very much to do with the sting of every accusation, we cannot but feel that there must be something especially odious in this charge, to account for the irritation which it has caused in Italy. We have not been angry at being twitted with "English luxury"; nay, many amongst us rather enjoy it than otherwise. We resemble the self-complacent old squire in the family pew, spoken of by Washington Irving, who chuckled at seeing the eyes of his poorer parishioners directed towards him whenever the parson spoke of the difficulty of a rich man's entering the Kingdom of Heaven. We rejoice to think that there is a good deal of luxury in England; that it is not confined to a few thousands of the upper ranks, but that it is diffused through many ranks and sections of society. But the Italian does not like to be told of his corruption. Why is this? Is it because the charge is both true and disgraceful?

In the first place, what is meant by corruption? We observe that almost all the Italian journals restrict its meaning to that looseness of relation between the sexes which in England monopolizes the designation of immorality. Starting from this point, it is not wonderful that the Italian writers retort upon the French the imputations which have been launched against themselves by Trochu. "Italian corruption, forsooth!" they exclaim; "that's a good joke indeed! Has General Trochu, since he has taken up his quarters at Versailles, forgotten Paris? Has he entirely erased from his memory the Imperial and pre-Imperial capital? Does he suppose that the Boulevard des Italiens is at Rome? that the Vaudeville and the Variétés are Italian theatres? that the Mabile is a Florentine institution, and Thérèse a Neapolitan singer? Was the can-can an Italian invention? Is the Bois de Boulogne at Florence? Are the *petites dames* who drive their elegant broughams to meet their lovers there and return to dine with them at Philippe's, daughters of Venice and Milan? Are the *petits crevés* whose vicious tastes and unmerited wealth minister to the indulgence of the painted dolls, natives of Italian cities and bearers of Italian names?" &c. &c. All this is a fair retort. Take corruption in the limited sense here attributed to it, and it reigns undoubtedly in greater strength at Paris than in any other city of Europe. But it does not reign generally in France more than in other European countries. This is a point which is too commonly forgotten. Men judge of France from Paris, and, because Paris is the most dissolute of capitals, infer that France is the most dissolute of nations. This inference is unjust. Loose, frivolous, and corrupt as is life in Paris, life in the French provinces is neither dissolute nor reckless. Indeed, it might be justly said that if prudery has her chosen seats and favourite haunts anywhere, she has them in very small French provincial towns. Paris is corrupt, not because it represents French immorality, but because it concentrates within its walls the means and appliances of cosmopolitan debauchery. The other great cities of France are probably about as corrupt as cities of the same size in other countries.

Thus the Italian rejoinder is good as far as concerns Paris. It is not so cutting as regards France. It is possible that Paris may be a more dissolute city than any in Italy, and yet that, in the aggregate,

gate, French corruption may be less glaring than Italian. Is this the case? We feel some unwillingness to pronounce an opinion, and an equal unwillingness to examine the facts upon which an opinion ought to rest. We confess indeed to a prejudice in favour of the Italians. We are charmed with their manners in society. We appreciate their general good-nature, which contrasts so agreeably with the average temper and bearing of the French. We like the natural politeness of the peasantry and artisans—of such of them, at any rate, as are not Reds. We have but one grave fault to reproach them with; namely, their fierce and insensate cruelty to dumb animals. But this is the result of an ignorance which neither the Government nor the priests have enlightened. The omission has led many foreigners to conclude that the Italian peasantry are wholly brutal and cowardly—a conclusion very far from the truth. Most of their instincts are very good; indeed, so good that we feel absolutely hurt because they do not often develop into corresponding conduct. But if we use the opportunities of investigation which a residence in Italy affords, we cannot forbear from admitting that the charge of dissoluteness is not ill-founded, in the case of the great towns at all events. Against the peasantry and small proprietary classes we hear very little asserted, and we believe that very little can be truly asserted to their disadvantage. We prefer to think that their conduct is quite as good as that of similar classes in France, Belgium, or England; and at any rate it may be safely said that there are not in Europe men more temperate and industrious than the small cultivators in the old Duchies of Tuscany and Lucca. But of the upper and middle classes in the richer cities of Italy the same good account cannot be given. One has only to mark the ordinary tenor of social life, and listen to its current gossip, in order to become aware that the moral code is either very lax or very generally disregarded. A well-known diplomatist, not very strait-laced, used to say of Florence in his day, that the best introduction to its society was to “keep a carriage and no character.” And the peculiar habits of many of those foreigners who make Florence or Naples their perpetual residence justify an inference which might safely be drawn from the conversation of the natives themselves.

The main cause of this corruption is evident. It is the bad education of the men. We say distinctly, of the men. For of late years female education in Italy has much improved; and on the whole, perhaps, educated Italian women are more thoroughly educated than French women. At all events the women are, as a rule, superior to the men. We do not mean that an Italian boy is not well instructed. As far as books go, he learns quite as much as an English boy—often a good deal more. But all that education which, under a good system, boys impart to each other, is absent from his curriculum. He has no playground; no healthy games to brace his pluck and his strength; no frequent intercourse with masses of his school-fellows by which a healthy public opinion may be formed. He goes from his home to his school, says his lessons, and returns home through the city. For amusement he does what he sees other boys and young men do. He lounges. He has no recreation but to *flâner*; to walk along the Chiaja or the Cascine, and discuss the ladies who pass, their carriages, their dresses, their complexions, and their lovers. Everything he sees and hears tells him of idleness, frivolity, and laxity. The whole tone of life is struck in a feeble and unmanly key. There may be no open, palpable, gross vice in the streets, but the whole social system is regulated so as to gloss over and facilitate that which would be called vice in other countries. There is no patent, ostentatious vice, but there is no small latent impurity; and where there is no impurity, there is much frivolity. Above all, that which strikes a foreigner the most is the utter absence of respect for women in Italy. There is hardly that mockery of courtesy which in France passes for politeness. There is, in the cities, though not in the villages, a hard, rough way of addressing women, an indelicacy of demeanour in the presence of women, and a general disregard for the feelings of women, which seem incompatible, not only with the traditional *gentilezza* of Italy, but with the first and faintest notions of civilization. Is it strange that boys trained up in such a state of things, seeing the ordinary sights and hearing the ordinary gossip of Italian cities, should become idle, frivolous, dissipated, and, in one sense of Trochu's phrase, corrupt? If the conditions which we have mentioned were not sufficient to account for this result, it would be explained by a foolish and unhappy social law recognised in Italy. This law denies to the scions of high families the careers of medicine and jurisprudence. No young man of a certain position goes to the Bar. The enormous political mischief which must be caused by conferring upon men who have neither the traditions nor the sentiments of gentlemen the vast powers which, under any system, the profession of the law cannot fail to exercise, is too obvious to need comment. Equally obvious is the mischief inflicted by conferring upon such men the authority of judges with small salaries. But it is the social mischief of which we now speak. And it is clear that idleness and frivolity are greatly stimulated when young men of good birth have only three courses of life open to them—that of entering the bureaux of the civil service; that of entering the army; and that of spending their patrimony in the way most likely to combine enjoyment of pleasure with exemption from debt.

So far for one kind of corruption. But it is not improbable that General Trochu had another kind in his mind's eye when he spoke. Our generation in England knows so little of administra-

tive corruption that it hardly suspects its existence in other countries. The very notion of a man going to the First Lord of the Admiralty and offering him five hundred pounds for the command of a ship in favour of his son, or of a lady going to the Minister of Justice and threatening to have him attacked by the press if he does not mitigate the sentence of some prisoner, or of some rich broker or banker offering a thousand pounds to a Finance Minister for early information on a loan or a budget, sounds to us so wildly strange and improbable that we hesitate to admit the possibility of the fact. Yet that these things have been done in modern Italy, and, though privately and decorously, not without the knowledge of many, and the collusive approbation of more, is unfortunately too true. That the bribe or the threat generally succeeds, we do not say; for even under bad systems there are honourable men. But it is not resented as a flagrant outrage. The briber or the threatener is not kicked downstairs. He is not turned out of society. The offer is not denounced as an abnormal and portentous scandal. In the lowest grades of the civil service bribes are offered and received without scruple or reluctance; and the general opinion of the Italian peasantry is that every functionary of the Government has his price, and that taxes are imposed or remitted, not according to the wealth or poverty of the taxed, or to any fixed rule, but according to the smallness or largeness of the bribe offered to the assessor.

It is not our desire to overstate the case against Italy, and we should have been happy if there had been no case against her at all. It is true that “corruption,” of one kind at least, exists in other countries also. But we suspect that it does not exist in other countries to the same extent, nor does it colour national life so much, as it does in Italy. Elsewhere men are forced to do something else than lounge. They must work; and a life of work is inconsistent with that which idlers call a life of pleasure. Only a few can take to the folly and frivolity which seem to characterize the daily life of well-born Italians. Still we do not despair of the future of Italy. Other nations have outlived and overcome corruption; she may do the same. She is young as a constitutional country; she is equally young as a nation; and we have no right to expect from her the strength and the virtues of maturity. She has at any rate virtues of her own which conciliate the good wishes of the world, and her virtues we believe to be quite susceptible of correction. So far as they affect her public life, a longer acquaintance with free government and the searching processes of Parliamentary discussion will mitigate them. As regards her social sins, we believe they will be repressed by a more virile education of her sons, by opening new careers to their talents and ambition, by placing their judges in such a position as to be above corruption and contempt, and by inculcating the too unfamiliar virtue of a chivalrous respect for women.

#### THE LORD'S DAY SOCIETY.

SOME twenty years ago the present Master of the Temple, Dr. Vaughan, then Head-Master of Harrow, was drawn into a controversy about certain postal regulations recently introduced by the Government with a view of securing the transmission of letters through London on Sundays; the *Record* and the “Lord's Day Society” were up in arms on the subject, and Dr. Vaughan was publicly denounced from the pulpit for declining to join in a protest against the new arrangement. He defended his conduct in an able and temperate pamphlet, showing, among other things, that, according to the official calculations, the amount of Sunday labour throughout the country would be considerably diminished by the change. But this only made matters worse. The *Record* was content to describe him, with guarded malignity, as “a respectable man, occupied for the last three months in reading nothing but the *Times*”; a remarkable mode of occupation, no doubt, for the Head-Master of one of the largest public schools in England, though it may be questioned if a supplementary study of the publications of the “Lord's Day Society” would have done much to improve it. But a brother clergyman and personal friend, now, we believe, Head-Master of Repton, was less reserved in his comments. He not only denounced Mr. Rowland Hill, the author of the new regulations, as animated by deliberate hatred to Christianity in general and Sabbath observances in particular; but intimated to Dr. Vaughan, in language which, to speak mildly, was the reverse of courteous, that he was greatly imperilling his own eternal interests as well as other people's by the line he had taken. Dr. Pears proceeded to construct for his benefit a sort of graduated series of religious axioms, or “*Rudimenta Minor*” of theology, the nature and relevancy of which may be gathered from the ninth and last axiom, “That it is better for 60,000 letters to be burned unopened than for one Post Office clerk to perish in hell for ever.” Yet, with strange inconsistency, he in the same letter treated the circumstance of not one, but twenty-six, clerks having been all along employed in the London Post Office on Sunday as a matter of entire indifference. The letter ended much as the Pope generally ends a more than usually maledictory Encyclical, by an earnest prayer that his opponent might learn to “submit his powers to the guidance of the Holy Spirit,” and eventually “be enabled to look with confidence to an abundant entrance into that rest which remaineth for the people of God,” and was signed “Yours, in Christian fidelity.” We have no desire now to disinter-



a long-buried controversy about certain details of postal arrangements, or to discuss Dr. Vaughan's opinions on Sunday observance, which were more fully explained a year or two later in a letter on the Crystal Palace question, as to the general principles of which most reasonable men would probably agree. But the whole method and spirit of conducting the discussion on the Sabbatarian side was so very characteristic that it was inevitably recalled to our mind on reading an account of the proceedings of the meeting of the Lord's Day Society on Tuesday last. There are indeed few points on which a large class of religious persons are so inconsistent, so intolerant, and to outside spectators so almost grotesque in their notions and practices, as in this of the due observance of what they are pleased to call "the Sabbath."

The chief practical object of the meeting of the "Lord's Day Rest Society" on Tuesday, so far as we can gather from the report, as also from the memorial they subsequently presented to Mr. Bruce, was to protest against what Mr. T. Chambers called the other day in the House of Commons "the virtual repeal of the Act of Charles II.," by reserving to the police the right of instituting prosecutions for its infraction; in other words, they wished to protest against the suppression of "the Rev. Bee Wright," though the Committee disclaimed having themselves taken any part in his recent operations. Lord Shaftesbury, indeed, characterized the Act in language which, to say the least, was somewhat enthusiastic, as "the most remarkable on the Statute-book, and one of the most valuable ever passed by the Legislature of this country"; its value, moreover, depending in great measure on "this magnificent characteristic," that it was passed "at a most infamous period and in the time of a most infamous Court"—in the reign, the speaker might have added, of the son of the monarch who had sanctioned "the most impious" *Book of Sports*, issued by Laud. In short, it was a kind of spoiling of the Egyptians. As we ourselves not long ago recommended that method of dealing with the Act which Mr. Bruce, in some exceptionally lucid interval, has seen fit to adopt, we need hardly say that we approve of the modification of "the most remarkable Act" in the Statute-book which Mr. Chambers, who was one of the speakers at the meeting, so indignantly condemns. The Committee of the Lord's Day Society had, however, other grave matters to deal with besides the Act of Charles II. They had to announce the astounding fact, which we accept in faith but find it difficult to realize, that "upwards of 70,000 publications on the Sabbath question have been issued during the past year." They had also to express their regret "that at certain public schools, like the Charterhouse and others, scholars who were permitted to leave on Saturday were required to return on Sunday evenings, to do which they were often obliged to use omnibuses and railways on Sundays." One is tempted to inquire whether any members of the "Lord's Day Society" ever indulge in so profane a habit. At all events, it is satisfactory to know that "a letter on the subject has been addressed to the principals of two schools," but sad rather than surprising to find that "no reply or acknowledgment has ever been received." We are afraid the two principals are in as unregenerate, if not hopeless, a condition as Dr. Vaughan and the "one Post Office clerk." The Committee, however, console themselves with the consideration that no change has been made in the arrangements of the Crystal Palace; and as only shareholders are admitted to the building, the average Sunday attendance is but ninety. We have already referred to the speech of Lord Shaftesbury, who called on his hearers "to stand out nobly and stiffly for the observance of the Lord's Day." After his Lordship's departure, Mr. Reed, M.P., addressed the meeting, and having delivered himself of the obvious truism that "no public servant ought to be employed unnecessarily on the Sabbath," added an enigmatic remark in reference to the new School Boards which, unless it is also a truism, is not very easy to comprehend. He thought there would be a difficulty in introducing any particular creed into rate-supported schools, but "maintained that the Bible was the people's book and not the book of any sect, and the Sabbath was the people's day and not the day of any sect or creed." We fail to catch the point of the antithesis. Certainly the Bible is the people's book and the Sabbath the people's day, if it be meant that the people have a right to read the Bible as much or as little as they please, and to enjoy the Sabbath as best they please. But we should have said, judging from experience, that the Bible was quite as truly the Church's book, and Sunday the Church's day and the sects' day also. Indeed, both the Church and the sects have usually shown a good deal more eagerness than the people to appropriate both the book and the day. We might perhaps go further and say that, unless the Church or the sects undertake the business, the chances of "the children being taught out of the Bible," which Mr. Reed considers their inalienable right, are somewhat precarious.

It would, however, be a mistake to imagine that peculiar crotchets about what Mrs. Proudie would have called "Sabbath Day observance" are confined to the Lord's Day Society or the party it represents. There are few points, as we have said, about which religious people, at least within the four seas, are so crotchety or so diverse in their views. There are some, as we have seen, who regard the casual use of any public conveyance as sinful on a Sunday. We heard not long ago of a clergyman who had occasion to travel by railway on Sunday, thinking it necessary to make an elaborate apology to—of all people in the world—Baron Rothschild, whom he chanced to meet on the platform, and who very naturally replied that his objections would have applied, if at all,

to the previous day. There are some, on the other hand, who will use public vehicles, but will not use their own. In the matter of literature, again, there is the widest variety of sentiment. We have heard of households where the post-bag is carried on Sunday to the breakfast table, and solemnly deposited by the head of the family under lock and key till Monday morning. As a rule, however, the reading and even writing of letters is held to be permissible, but there many excellent persons draw a rigid line. To write anything intended for the press, or to read any printed matter not distinctly "sacred," would be a heinous sin. Then there is an intermediate theory, which forbids secular reading in general, but makes an exception—why, is not very obvious—in favour of newspapers and quarterlies; we say quarterlies, because monthlies are apt to contain stories, and stories not labelled sacred, especially novels, are of course strictly tabooed. About theatres and operas the public have no choice in England; but even British piety is sometimes tempted beyond its power of endurance when a popular opera is to be heard on Sunday, and on Sunday only, in a foreign capital. In most cases to do at Rome as Romans do is a principle rather acted upon than openly avowed. We have heard a story of a Scotch Presbyterian lady on a visit to London, who acted, not without qualms of conscience, in a similar spirit. She was anxious, among other metropolitan spectacles, to witness "the high celebration" at St. Alban's, Holborn, and thither accordingly she repaired. The music was good, and the lady had a musical ear, and was altogether much pleased with the performance; but her conscience pricked her afterwards, and she confided to a friend that "it was very fine—but, it was an awful way of spending the Sabbath." The feelings of the British tourist who deserts "Dearly Beloved" for High Mass at the Madeleine or St. Peter's are perhaps of a somewhat similar kind, if he would honestly confess it. We must not, however, let our Roman Catholic friends suppose that they can have the laugh wholly to themselves. Their Church, it is true, lays no embargo on any kind of secular reading or amusement, but it lays a very strict embargo on all "servile work" on Sundays. And the distinctions drawn by casuists as to what is and what is not servile work are often minute and mysterious enough to puzzle the most ingenious Sabbatarian. All intellectual work, for instance, however laborious, is allowable, but all needlework, however purely recreative and ornamental, is forbidden. Yet one hardly sees why it should be right to devote Sunday to making up a ledger or writing a learned book or drafting a Bill for Parliament, and wicked to hem a pocket-handkerchief or work a pair of slippers; the latter sort of employment might even appear to ordinary apprehensions the less onerous and "servile" of the two. But there is, if we are not misinformed, a yet further refinement in this matter of needlework, where the exception is almost more perplexing than the rule. Ritualists may be glad to learn that stoles and chasubles can be embroidered on Sunday with impunity, but then they must remember that it is unlawful to stitch a surplice or an alb. That there is, or once was, some sort of *rationale* of these and other equally recondite distinctions, it is only natural to believe; and indeed the very terms of the prohibition of "servile work" recall us to the original intention of all Church legislation on the subject, which was evidently to secure for slaves and the labouring classes generally as much rest and recreation on the weekly festival of the Resurrection as circumstances would permit.

This leads us to say a word in conclusion on the origin of Sunday observance in the Christian Church. Into the Scriptural argument we need not enter further than to remark that there is no trace of the Jews' Sabbath ever being identified in the New Testament with the Christian Sunday, or of the day itself being observed as such. On the other hand, the first day of the week, or the "Lord's Day," as it is in one place called, seems to have been observed for worship, and especially for the celebration of the Eucharist, from the apostolic age. There are frequent references to its observance in writers of the first three centuries, who sometimes called it the Lord's Day, sometimes Sunday, or the day of the Sun, but never the Sabbath. To do so would have led to manifest confusion, for the Sabbath, or Saturday, was from a very early period observed widely in the Church as a fast, not on Jewish grounds, but in memory of our Lord lying on that day in the grave. At a later period it came to be observed in the West in honour of the Virgin Mary, and there is still, we believe, an *Officium B. Mariæ in Sabbato* to be found in the Roman Breviary. Perhaps we might venture to suggest to members of the Lord's Day Society and their friends that it would be well for them to drop all use of a term which has been so terribly desecrated. Moreover, not only do these early writers never call the day the Sabbath, but they never base the obligation of keeping it on Jewish custom or on the Fourth Commandment. The fact of its being already a day "venerated" in the Church is implied in the language of the edict of the first Christian Emperor enjoining its observance, and is still more clearly implied in the twentieth Canon of Nice. The edict of Constantine, being the first of the kind, and in some sense the model of all later legislation on the subject, may be worth quoting as its stands:—

Omnes judices, urbanæque plebes et cunctarum artium officia venerabili Die Solis quiescant. Ruri tamen positi agrorum cultura libere licentetque inserviant, quoniam evenit ut sæpe illo die frumenta sulcis aut vineas proventus mandarent, ne occasione momenti pereat commoditas celesti provisione concessa.

We are not sure that this decree would quite satisfy the requirements of modern Sabbatarianism. But it will perhaps appear, on the whole, that the only two points in regard to the day on which Christians of all ages have been generally agreed are—first, the duty of public worship; and secondly, the duty of resting, and enabling others to rest, from the ordinary business of life on the weekly festival of the Resurrection. In the method of carrying out these objects, and still more in all further modes of honouring the day, there have been in different times and places almost infinite differences of detail, both among Catholics and Protestants. But all testimony goes to confirm Baxter's conclusion, that "from and in the apostles' days the Churches unanimously agreed in the holy use of it as a separated day." Though the name of Sabbath has been frequently applied to it of late in the pastorals of French bishops and in other kindred documents, there is, we believe, no example of such a use, or misuse, of language before the Reformation.

#### INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.—THE PICTURE GALLERIES.

##### III.

IN this our concluding notice we shall speak of the contributions of France and of England. Each country is strangely and inadequately represented; exceptional and unsaleable pictures again thrust themselves forward obnoxiously. By this time it is of course pretty well understood, though the truth has been skillfully disguised, that these International Galleries are a universal hash, the boilings up and the washings out of European art. Still International rubbish in the gross is somewhat relieved by individual excellence. As to England and France, the two nations now falling under notice, we are chiefly interested in reviving recollections of works known long ago, and of masters who are dead or perhaps wholly changed. We will then turn to compositions which pleasantly sketch the retrospect of times that are past—pictures which tell how currents now set, how the spirit of art moves and works among leading nations in Europe.

The French Galleries are occupied by works which have become familiar either in Bond Street, Pall Mall, or Continental Exhibitions. Of the Parisian school we have had better opportunities of speaking, yet in a haphazard way great artists are scattered on the walls. It may be of interest once more to glance at the revolutions which art has undergone. In the pictures of David, Horace Vernet, Delaroche, Ary Scheffer, Delacroix, Decamps, Hébert, Regnault, and Courbet, we trace the history and transition of Parisian art from the first Revolution to the reigns of the Legitimists, the Orleanists, the Bonapartes, down to the siege of Paris and the misrule of the Commune. Striking and revolting in its naturalism is David's "Death of Marat," a creature said to be, as here depicted, ill-shaped and diseased in body and repulsive in countenance. This famous picture is thinly and poorly painted; the colour is that of the period—raw, discordant, and unpleasing. The contrast is marked between the pictorial qualities which signalized the first Revolution and the last. Classicism has become all but extinct. We find on the fall of the Napoleon dynasty, colour passionate and decorative as in the pictures of M. Roybet (1296) and M. Regnault (1469); at the same time sentiment and character become enervated, as in the contributions of M. Hamon (1437), M. Lévy (1265), and M. Hébert (1241). In contrast, as we have said, M. Courbet, now a prisoner for acts worthy of his forerunner David, raises even in his art the banner of revolt, repudiates, as befits a true child of revolution, all refinement, and reduces painting to barbarism. It is curious to remark how totally opposed are the pictorial styles of the two men; revolutions repeat themselves, painters have recourse to guillotines and barricades, and yet, as we have said, between the art of 1793 and of 1871 there is little in common. A chief cause of this discrepancy appears to be that David gained a certain exaltation from the Greeks, while M. Courbet seeks to degrade his art by converse with the lowest nature. Yet M. Courbet has produced works which prove singular powers joined to all the perversity of misdirected talent. The artist is seen at Kensington by four works. A mere "Horse" (1342) he manages to make repulsive; he seldom condescends either to drawing or detail. We have on another occasion spoken of a bloody affair, the "Execution in a Moor's Palace" (1469), by M. Regnault, a young artist who was shot dead in a sortie from Paris. M. Regnault was of that art brotherhood which gloats on horrors and feeds on massacres; his own fate has been prefigured in his pictures. M. Gérôme, here ill seen, is yet another artist who has consecrated painting to cruelty, and devoted humanity to dishonour. In fact, Parisian pictures of the last ten years have been the prophecy of coming disaster. Gorged in blood, reckless of human life, indifferent to suffering, preferring the dramatic action attendant upon vice to the repose which is the reward of virtue, the large canvasses paraded year by year in the Salon have been preludes to revolutions, sieges, and national dishonour. M. Corot's "Sodom" (1168), the city in flames, with figures flying from avenging wrath, is typical of the fate of the fairest city in France.

Some few works tell of calmer counsels. The manner of Delaroche in "Marie Antoinette" (1201) is heavy, sober, and infirm. Yet "St. Cecilia" (1423), by the same artist, and an equally well-known subject (1298), by Ary Scheffer, show how painters under the Orleanists strove for purity of form and elevation of sentiment. Still, each pictorial phase seems

to provoke its opposite; and so the pale placidity of Scheffer and the calm dignity of Delaroche had their set-off in the passion and abandon of Decamps and Delacroix. Exultant and extravagant, impetuous and impatient, are such works as "Mirabeau and the Marquis of Dreux-Brézé" (1196), "Waterloo" (1193), "L'Amende Honorable" (1194), and "Christ on the Lake of Gennesareth" (1199), all by Delacroix. Here restless force, and yet irremediable infirmity, equally move the mind of the spectator to amazement. Of Delacroix very much might be written, but the shortest way to understand him is to see him. He composed in the heat of imagination; he drew with his brush; form was to him but a phase of colour; hence the indecision of his outlines. M. Roybet, a living artist, exhibits "A Fight" (1296), after the manner of Delacroix. How versatile and creative is French art receives illustration in a remarkable composition of M. Tissot's, "L'Image de la Vie," a kind of Dance of Death. French art, even when it copies, originates; it borrows, and with a liberal hand repays more than it takes.

MM. Meissonier, Frère, and Duverger cannot be expected to strike out anything fresh; their works are as well known as the six-and-twenty letters of the alphabet. Among French naturalists, MM. Ribot, Brion, Bonnat, and Breton have little new to show. Yet the "Raft on the Rhine" (1150) is M. Brion's masterpiece. M. Breton's Snow Scene (1330), the snow not white but slushy and dirty, shows with what singleness of affection certain Frenchmen cling to unalluring and absolutely repulsive phases of nature. Here are likewise seen magnificent but melancholy monotonies by M. Daubigny—works inimitable in their way and yet wholly abnormal—dreary as a desert, dark as an eclipse, singularly blind to beauty. We incline to think that M. Daubigny, M. Corot, and others of their company make too great a sacrifice for tone and unison; they induce nature to utter a wail or breathe a sigh, and then she subsides into silence and twilight. They extinguish colour, and then, in the midst of the negation, they kindle a lumbrous fire, a faint suspicion of warmth, and this passes for sentiment. But nature has many voices; she does not speak in monologue only. The landscapes here seen of MM. Rousseau, Ziem, Belly, Dupré, and Anastasi, are in a brighter and more joyous mood. We would also direct attention to some superb specimens of M. Isabey. "A Sea Piece" (1244) is specially remarkable for the dash and swing of boats driven by a squall into harbour, for the bold action of the figures, and for the picturesque character of the tumble-down houses huddling together as for mutual protection on the storm-lashed shore. The landscapes in the Galleries are well worthy of study; they should not be without influence on our English school.

Much also may be learnt from the many admirable specimens of animal painting. Lions abound, and we are glad to be able to say that the finest beast does not come from the Continent, but from the easel of our own Sir Edwin Landseer (398 A). Savage animals, no less than civilized human beings, receive divers treatments at the hand of art. The monarch of the forest is, by our English artist, delineated as tamed by Van Amburgh. The French, on the contrary, bring into action the fiend-like ferocity of wild beasts of the forest. These are put upon canvas as ready for onslaught and rapine, whereas with us they are as a happy family caged for a peace congress. A like difference, both in spirit and in handling, divides the two schools throughout their entire range. Of late, however, Madlle. Rosa Bonheur has tamed down her manner to our English quietism. She is seen in four works, and the never-to-be-forgotten M. Troyon in nine. We may add that the best barndoor fowls which ever entered a picture gallery are supplied by M. Jacque and M. Couturier (1247 and 1179); also that, as usual, the most perfect still life the world has yet known comes from M. Desgoïffes (1205). The above list of miscellanies may conclude with M. Decadre's "Nude Figure" (1453), a work which, as one of the most artistic of its kind, was rewarded, when exhibited in Manchester, by a first prize. The French, it is well known, have given themselves much to nudities; partly because for twenty years history offered but poor materials for the pencil, and partly because intellectual action and national life have been systematically severed from the arts. The sore experience through which a great people has passed may possibly impart more earnestness to their art.

The English Galleries do not call for criticism, because what is good is not new, and what is new is not good. The chief pictures exhibited have long since received notice in our columns. Still the collection is not without a certain retrospective value. For example, it cannot be otherwise than instructive and pleasant to renew acquaintance with "The Visitation and Surrender of Syon Nunnery, Isleworth" (129), by Mr. Poole, R.A.; "From Dawn to Sunset" (229), painted ten years ago by Mr. Fied, R.A.; "Waiting for the Verdict" (41), a well remembered composition by the late A. Solomon; the portrait of "Macready as Werner" (330), by Mr. Maclise, R.A.; the portrait of "Thomas Carlyle" (318), by Mr. Watts, R.A.; "The Virgin and Child" (362), by Mr. Dyce, R.A. It may also be of interest to observe the alteration made by Mr. Millais in "The Knight Errant" (431). The original lady exhibited in the Royal Academy has been cut out down to her waist, a piece of new canvas inserted, and the nude figure repainted, with this difference, that the face of the fair captive is now turned away from her deliverer. Room VIII. contains a pretty good summary of the art of painting in water-colours; most of the works have already appeared in one or other of the established Societies; exceptional worth attaches to a study (1808) made fifteen years since by Mr. Holman Hunt for "The Finding in the Temple." Much dis-



satisfaction has been provoked by the tasteless manner in which choice water-colour drawings have been thrust, with chromolithographs and photographs, into the Albert Hall. Indeed, the hanging throughout the Galleries is ill-judged and unintelligible. We cannot, for instance, understand why that magnificent drawing "The Flight into Egypt" (241), the finest work we remember by Mr. Stanhope, should be used as a background to furniture. Equally hard is it to comprehend on what principle has been admitted at all "Charles Dickens, painted 1871, price 50 guineas" (45), by "Mason and Co." It is not easy to see how a portrait of a dead man can be painted by a "Company." We may next expect undertakers to appear as "artists."

These Picture Galleries must prove but gigantic failures unless they teach truths which we need to know, or correct errors under which European art may suffer. No fewer than eighteen countries are represented—viz. France, England, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Russia, Prussia, Saxe-Weimar, Baden, Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, and Poland. Several of these might have afforded us more instruction had they given fuller utterance to their ideas; one or two stray pictures cannot tell much. Russia, not to name other nations, may be said, indeed, scarcely to break silence as to the condition of her national art. What, then, are we taught that we did not know before? Little or nothing. Yet at any rate it may be conceded that conclusions previously arrived at receive confirmation. Thus it is once more made apparent that high art has fallen into disuse and disfavour; that classic, historic, and even Academic styles are at a discount. Accordingly about the only examples of these obsolete modes of treatment are "Camoens Shipwrecked" (845), by M. Slingeneer of Belgium; "The Holy Women and St. John at the foot of the Cross" (1054), by M. des Coudres of Baden; "The Burial of Christ" (1081), by Herr Roeting of Prussia; and "The Entombment" (1043), by Signor Ciseri of Italy. The paucity of religious works, compared with their preponderance in all collections of the old masters, is of course very apparent; it may be said, indeed, that European art has ceased to be Biblical, and that not because the old routine of sacred subjects is worn out, but mainly from the loosening of the bonds which formerly held religion and art together. The survey of the Galleries, in fact, leads to the conclusion that old landmarks are removed, that European art is without grandeur, that old schools are broken up, that cherished truths are overturned. In place of what is gone, two principles, if principles they may be called, seem to be set up; the one is the secularization of art, the other the naturalization of art. We fail, however, to see in the examples before us a right understanding or a high interpretation of these art dogmas. For instance, in the rationalism which has set in we recognise no right conception of that eternal union between truth, beauty, and goodness whereon æsthetics as a theory should rest, and painting as a practice should depend. Again, naturalism, which is in some sense the synonym for truth, receives a low rendering in the modern art of Europe. The truth seized upon is not, as with the Greeks, a generic type or a high humanity; it is not, as with the early Italians, the embodiment of a spiritual life; it is not, as in the time of the Renaissance, a truth inalienable from beauty. The truth towards which art in all countries now tends is strong naturalism, illusive realism, and photographic individualism. Artists naturally paint what the public applaud. An old woman peeling potatoes or patching a petticoat receives nowadays more attention than the Venus of Milo or the Sibyls of Michael Angelo. It is but too evident that the contemporaneous art of Europe trusts to nothing nobler than incident and sentiment, character and costume, and an Exhibition into which thousands of the populace daily crowd is not likely to raise existing standards.

In conclusion, we may say that it seems doubtful how far the present wholesale and indiscriminate system of exhibition can be sustained. A programme is already published for the next ten years; 2,300 works are assembled in this first season; at the same rate an aggregate of 23,000 oil pictures and drawings will have been collected within ten years. Where are these vast supplies to come from? Perhaps from the "machinery in motion." Certainly the ordinary pictorial products of the decade will not be equal to the demand, unless indeed a descent be made to the very lowest pictorial grade. We would venture to suggest that it might be well in coming years to make the collections smaller, and proportionately more select. It might be wise that some specific department should be taken; thus, for instance, the present phase of historic art, of landscape art, or of genre painting, might be illustrated by choice specimens. Some such plan seems to be imperative; indeed, the original idea of these annual Exhibitions was that they should be small and choice rather than large and indiscriminate. The first experiment may be useful as a warning. It is evident that, unless the enterprise be conducted with better system and a higher intellectual aim, these Exhibitions must prove the reverse of educational.

#### ETON AND HARROW AT LORD'S.

THE Prince Imperial of Germany must certainly have thought it strange. One set of schoolboys arrange to play a game of ball against another set, and nearly twenty thousand people collect to see them do it; it is pretty evident that about ten thousand came to see the play, and the other ten came to see the first ten see it; the heir-apparent of Germany finally coming in to

see the whole. It would be interesting to know for certain what he thought about the whole concern. But we have no doubt that he watched it with a feeling of profound humiliation. It must have been the first public gathering at which he has assisted for a long time past at which, so far from being at the centre of the situation, he was, to use the expressive sporting phrase, nowhere. To feel your left wing, or push on your cuirassiers, or bring round your field artillery, are things which he must have felt are useful enough in their way, and it is the business of some people to know all about them; but they don't teach you to cut to the off. The excellent but uncricketing Prince!

That never set eleven in the field,  
Nor the division of an innings knows  
More than a spinster,

or indeed half so well as a good many of the boys' sisters on the ground, is really much to be pitied; and his desire to have presented to him, or rather shall we say his request to be introduced to, the captains of the two sides, was but a mark of proper respect to the dignity of the pursuit on which the attention of London was fixed. Seriously, the fashionableness of this match must have reached its climax. It has gone far beyond what would have been thought possible ten years ago, and still further beyond what is desirable in the interests of cricket or of the players. The only hope is that the fashion may change. The day will always be popular for the sake of the game itself, and through the sympathies of the friends of either school; and the touch of romance which hangs about it, the general wish to consider boys as pets, the prettiness of the sight, will for ever crowd the ground while the match is played as it is. But even as all pleasures decay—as Ranelagh is dead, as even Epsom is slowly dying, so it may be expected, and it must certainly be hoped, that the Eton and Harrow match may cease at last to be the fashionable gathering of the year. For a long time there have been those who have been scandalized at the publicity given to mere play, and have wondered whether it is good for boys to be brought forward to show off their hitting and running before so many thousand people. Can it be right, they ask, to turn mere play into a piece of acting on such a gigantic scale? It seems to us that the answer to this question is clear. Just so long as there is nothing histrionic in the performance, the practice is a healthy one; and there are no signs at present of its taking that direction. The spectacle is redeemed from all such mischief by its evident sincerity. The real interest in the game far outweighs the theatrical effect; a boy goes into the field not to play a part, but unmistakably to beat the opposite side. Any attempt to show off, any affectation in manner, any extra flourish with bat or ball, would be what cricketers call "bad form"; and so long as this understanding continues, and the game is played for its own sake, and with its present eagerness, there need be but little fear of an injurious social tendency.

This year the game itself was less interesting than usual. Eton was known to have the stronger eleven of the two, and for the fifth year running it won the toss. Every year shows more and more clearly what a difference this makes to a school eleven. Old cricketers can play with more coolness; their imagination is less excited by success or failure early in the game, and they know how chances vary from hour to hour. But the depressing effect upon a boy of seeing his best bowling hit about must be felt to be understood. Everything appears hopeless; the batsman is invincible, his very bat looks as if it covered twice the natural width. It seems as if it were no use trying to win. "How is it," said an old amateur the other day to a professional bowler, after the latter had had his bowling severely punished by the great hitter of the day, "how is it that Mr. Grace hits you about so? I thought you could put your ball pretty well where you like." "So I can," was the reply, "and so I do put 'em just where I like; but bless him, sir, he puts 'em just where he likes!" The latter part of the remark, at all events, seemed true on Friday last of the Eton batting, though, as regards the bowling which they had to meet, the case was rather that the ball seemed to go according to its own pleasure than that of the bowler. There has seldom been a school match in which the bowling "fell to pieces" so completely after the first half-hour. The interest of the game as a competition between the schools was over long before lunch on the first day. So clearly was this the case that it is even creditable to the losing side that they showed so little signs of demoralization. They have been accused, in many quarters, of bad fielding, but the charge is rather exaggerated. The fielding was not positively good; it was not showy or dashing; but it was fair, considering the length of the innings, and we have seen worse on both sides within the last few years. As to the bowling, there was one boy who was fairly straight, but easy; and the four others were easy and by no means straight. In fact, the school had come to the ground with no slow bowler, no fast bowler, and no underhand bowler, and on this occasion for once the right man had not been discovered, as had so often happened before, about a week before the match. It is this, rather than any great superiority of Eton batting, which accounts for the long score. Each of the two chief Eton batsmen played a creditable innings, creditable about in proportion to the runs which they actually got; for that of the captain included one chance which was not accepted. They both played admirably at straight balls, and at balls between the leg and the wicket, which are generally found so difficult; and all the play on the "on" side was above the average. But, strange to say, and in contradistinction to what had

been expected from the batting at Eton, ball after ball on the "off" was left untouched, and the innings, though creditable, cannot be called actually brilliant. The match followed, till near its end, the course of that of 1866, the positions being reversed. In that year, indeed, the game was won more by batting than by bowling, but the scores were curiously alike in the two years, the former being eventually the more hollow victory of the two. This year the light-blue bowling was good enough to win most matches, and though the Harrow batting was up to a fair average, it was fairly beaten by it. The ground seemed to suit the fast bowling very remarkably; at least something is needed to account for the fact that not only some but all of the leg-balls were let off, and that repeatedly, after a Harrow batsman had been showing very good play for half-a-dozen overs, his wicket was taken by a ball which appeared at the pavilion to be as simple as any of those that he had stopped. Meanwhile the Eton fielding was thoroughly good, and, with the exception of a little slackness near the end of the match, it was as fine as we ever wish to see at a public school. The men were placed with great judgment, and supported one another perfectly, and over and over again a two was turned into a one by a rapid recovery and straight throw, and by the moral effect which a continuance of such fielding produces on the mind of the batsman.

We do not feel at all disposed to be hard on Harrow for their defeat. When a school bat very badly, or field very badly, they deserve to be told in public as well as in private that they are to blame, and that it is simply their own fault or that of the traditions of the place. Boys can be taught to hold a bat straight, and to stop and throw a ball, and they have no business to come to Lord's without having learnt to do it. But when their bowling is bad they are rather to be pitied than blamed. It is curious that a bowler cannot be found in a school of five hundred boys; but if he does not exist, and cannot be created, there is no more to be said on the matter. Speaking of the elevens as a whole, we should say that in batting there is not much to choose between them. It may seem paradoxical to assert this in the face of the scores, but by the end of the day's play there were not many judges of the game who had not come to much the same conclusion. If there be a difference, it is rather on the side of Eton, which seemed to have stronger men. As regards the other branches of the game, there can be no comparison. We have spoken of the fielding already; and it need hardly be added that Eton could have played the match with any two of their four bowlers and won it. It is true that on this occasion the Harrow bowling fell below, while that of Eton rose above, the previous performances of the season; but, on the other hand, some of the fast deliveries of Eton showed to a disadvantage from being kept on too long at a time. Certainly Eton bowled at Lord's much better than it did against Winchester, in which match it was simply to the first-rate Winchester bowling that the result was due. It appeared to us that the slow underhand, in spite of the few wickets which it took, was the best; and the arrangement of the field while it was being tried was very remarkable. There are very few slow bowlers who can venture to leave the "on" side with but three men in the field, as we remember that Mr. Money did on the first occasion on which he bowled for Harrow, and as was done last Saturday; and wherever there are such, it may be safely predicted that their side will win a very large proportion of matches.

It is to be hoped, but hardly to be expected, that we shall be saved this year from the manifold controversies which it is so easy to get up on the cause of this or that success or failure. There are people about cricket-grounds, and we are not sure that there may not be some in the Marylebone Club itself, who are never tired of discussing the philosophy of a defeat, and inventing a thousand mysterious reasons for this or that result. To such people it never seems to occur that one of two sides must win, and that victory is likely generally to cling to the same school for two or three years in succession. It is always thought necessary to look to occult causes, and to connect half volleys and hits to leg with some predisposing influences at work of malign or beneficent potency. So, during the long series of years in which Harrow was victorious, the philosophers of Lord's were at work. It was impossible for Eton to win while it had so dead, or so level, a ground for practice; the Eton boys were always over-coached, or they were not coached enough; a school with the alternative of rowing could never be successful; the masters took too little interest, or they took too much interest, in the games; the collegers and oppidans never could make an eleven together with fairness. Now that these insuperable difficulties seem to have been fairly overcome, it will no doubt be time for the antistrophe with regard to Harrow. The Harrow eleven, we shall hear, is systematically formed of such old boys, and the others do not have a chance; or it is formed of such young boys, who cannot be expected to be strong; or the school work is so hard now, and cricketers cannot be scholars; or the work is so slight, and scholarship and cricket always go together; or boys come to Harrow too old to learn to play; or the Public School Commissioners insist on their leaving Harrow before they can possibly have learnt. The simple truth of the whole thing is that some boys have a gift of bowling and batting, and some have not; and that if a knot of three or four of the former sort happen to be at the same school together, they raise it in the world just as a few boating men raise a College on the river; they win their matches for the years in which they play, and set an example which for some time does not die. But it gives way whenever the same thing happens at the rival

school; and so the balance inclines, with perhaps some mysterious tendencies which may reveal themselves in the far distance of years; but from year to year with a result which we do not hesitate to ascribe simply to the chance which induces the parents of a future mighty batsman to send him to one school or the other. At the present moment, if we are rightly informed, the larger number of the elevens both at Eton and Harrow are destined to leave this year. If it be so, next year's battle will be fought with new armies, and as it were on a fresh field; and as Eton has now been victorious for three years, let us hope, we cannot say that Harrow's turn will now come—for in these pages we must profess strict impartiality—but at any rate that the victory may be more hardly contested, and that the struggle may be fought out on the same friendly terms which have now happily for the last three or four years characterized the annual match.

## REVIEWS.

### MORELET'S CENTRAL AMERICA.\*

THERE are vast tracts of the great isthmus joining the Northern and Southern continents of America the geography of which remains to this day as little known as that of the interior of Africa. Between Chiapa, Tabasco, and Yucatan on the north, and the Republic of Guatemala on the south, the maps either exhibit a total blank or fill up the space with mountains, lakes, and rivers by little more than the light of conjecture. The enterprise of recent travellers has led to the exploration of much of the territory bordering upon this unknown belt. The travels of Messrs. Waldeck, Stephens, Scherzer, and others have made the public acquainted with much of the physical features and social condition of Honduras, San Salvador, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. And the recent expeditions in search of a feasible line for a ship canal, as well as for the shortest railway route, have dissipated much of the obscurity which hung over the geography of the country. Much, nevertheless, was wanting to a complete view of the geography of Central America, comprising the whole territory lying between the Isthmus of Tehuantepec and that of Darien. The idea of penetrating this secluded and unknown region was formed a few years ago by M. Arthur Morelet, and encouraged by the French Institute, of which he was a member. Crossing the Atlantic, and plunging boldly into its recesses, he returned to France with an extensive collection of objects in every department of natural history and native art, as well as with valuable materials bearing upon the geography and ethnology of the country included in his tour, which subsequently extended itself to Guatemala, Yucatan, and Cuba. His scientific collection was deposited in the Paris Museum, and its newest and most rare varieties were described in the "Compte Rendu" of the Institute, as well as in other scientific serials; and the general results of his wanderings, printed for private circulation only, were embodied in his *Voyage dans l'Amérique centrale, l'île de Cuba, et l'Yucatan*. In preparing for more general diffusion the present translation, Mrs. M. F. Squier has thought it best to omit the chapter relating to M. Morelet's voyage across the Atlantic and his tour through the island of Cuba as of subordinate interest or importance. The thread of his narrative is taken up at the point where, leaving Campeachy, he entered upon ground untravellered before, and began the series of original explorations which have added much to our knowledge of this portion of the country. The map prefixed to the volume exhibits the track of M. Morelet's wanderings, which cover in general the vast delta of the Usumasinta, from the grand ruins of Palenque on the west to the singular basin of the mysterious Lake of Itza or Peten towards the east. From this central region his steps extended southward through a vast wilderness, and the hitherto untraversed and undescribed province of Vera Paz, to the city of Guatemala. Altogether some three hundred leagues were traversed by him, often on foot, amid no little difficulty and danger, both from climate and the jealousy of natives. M. Morelet's work is slight both in texture and design, and is far from assuming the character of a scientific survey. The natural features of the country are, however, marked by him with vividness and precision, and the incidents of travel furnish him with matter for a very agreeable narrative. He has met with a fluent and lively translator in Mrs. M. F. Squier, while an introduction and some critical notes have been added by Mr. E. G. Squier, than whom no man living knows more of Central America at large.

Among the curious relics of a lost civilization, few are more worthy of note than the stupendous ruins of Palenque. These monuments of a race and an era marked by high artistic aims and vast constructive skill are chronicles in stone which the ingenuity and skill of modern times are taxed in vain to decipher. After what has been done to set them before the eye of the public by Lord Kingsborough's magnificent volumes, and by the splendid plates contributed by Waldeck to the Abbé Bourbourg's fine series of Mexican Antiquities, we cannot expect much additional light to be thrown upon upon these mysterious ruins by an unaided traveller like M. Morelet. His description will, however, be read with interest as giving the impression wrought upon a sensitive and

\* *Travels in Central America*. From the French of the Chevalier Arthur Morelet, by Mrs. M. F. Squier. Introduction and Notes by E. Geo. Squier. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.



observant mind by these symbols or memorials of an extinct culture. Magnificent as they are in their antique boldness and strength, heightened by the atmosphere of solitude and desolation which surrounds them, they hardly justified in his eyes the enthusiasm of archaeologists. The ornamental lines seemed to him wanting in regularity, the drawings in symmetry, the sculpture in finish. An exception is made by him in favour of the symbolical tablets, the sculpture of which struck him as remarkably accurate. Among the noblest of these is the enigmatical bas-relief known as the "stone of the cross." Torn by profane hands from the sanctuary which sheltered it, and left at the foot of the hill to be disintegrated and destroyed piecemeal, this strange historical fragment, in which some have fancied they could recognise among the ritual emblems of the Mexican creed the symbol of Christian worship, seems destined to perish before the key to its hidden meaning has been brought to light by our savants. Awaiting the appearance of a second Champollion to undertake this puzzling task, M. Morelet remains content to see in it an Indian allegory, of which the leading representations were suggested by the native products of the country. The wood-cut accompanying his pages gives a good idea of the peculiar overhanging arcade which distinguishes the architecture of the palace. A double gallery, eighty yards in length, sustained by massive pillars, extends along the principal front of the building. The walls, inclined forwards towards each other from the architrave, form an acute angle, the point of which, seven feet from the ground, was truncated by a final horizontal layer of stones. Our author is mistaken in discerning here the true principle of the arch, the openings between the columns not being formed with voussoirs tongued or keyed together, but simply hewn in the horizontal layers of masonry, after the early fashion to be seen in what is called the treasury of Atreus at Mycenæ. The inner court, lined with gigantic idols, recalling the galleries of Karnak or Abou Simbel, is half hidden by wild vegetation. The whole edifice, indeed, is so buried in the depths of the forest that an idea of its size and shape is with difficulty obtained. The palace seems to have formed a vast parallelogram, very complicated in its arrangements, covering an area of 3,840 square yards. These ruins, it appears, were for the first time brought to light in the year 1750, during the administration of Don Antonio Calderon in Chiapa. It is strange that they escaped the notice of Cortes during his romantic and adventurous journey through Honduras. They may at that time have existed in the same dilapidated condition as now, memorials of a race even then long passed away, which once bore sway over the whole territory lying between Cape Catoche and the table-land of Mexico. Tracing them to Toltec origin, it may be possible to assign to them a date somewhat about the middle of the eleventh century of our era, when the great migration took place of that race which successively founded Tula, Mitla, Mayapan, and the other cities now in ruins on this peninsula. The Toltec race is even now not extinct in Guatemala, but glories in its ancient origin and achievements. The effects of climate, and the more destructive barbarism of travellers, have played sad havoc with these stately and picturesque ruins, even of recent years. Where are now, asks M. Morelet deplorably, those bas-reliefs in stucco so admired by Dupaix, and those allegorical sculptures which have been the source of so much learned discussion? What has become of the medallions which adorned the peristyle of the great palace? Vainly have vulgar and ruthless travellers sought to indemnify us for the mutilation they have wrought among these priceless monuments of early art by inscribing upon them their own worthless names.

The main object with M. Morelet was how to reach the mysterious district and lake of Peten. Even at Campeachy no one could tell him how to get there. It was only at Palizada that he obtained sufficient information to direct him to Tenosique, beyond which place all was obscure. Little intercourse prevails between Peten and Tabasco. It was with some difficulty that the necessary mules and guides were found. Burying themselves in the almost trackless forest, our travellers had a hard time of it with storm and flood, hunger and drought, their clothes and limbs torn with thorns, or with the rude contact with tree trunks, an opportune monkey now and then their sole means of diet. As Xenophon's weary host saluted the sea, so did the sinking band, bursting from the dark woods upon the broad and bright savannahs, hail the fair lake, the mysterious Peten or Itza of geographers, and the island described by Cortes as the stronghold of the warlike Itzaes. Flores, the little town which had supplanted the Indian city, is the capital of the district. It was on one of the islands which stud the lake that the missionary friars found to their surprise the figure of a horse fairly executed in stone and mortar. This was in honour of the wounded charger left by Cortes, to which on its death divine honours were decreed by the simple Indians under the name of Tziminchak. The new divinity was supposed to preside in some mysterious way over thunder and lightning, doubtless from a vague connexion in the native mind with the firearms of the Spanish cavaliers. The name itself, Mr. Squier explains, is derived from *timin*, the tapir, and *chak*, white, the tapir being the largest indigenous animal of Yucatan, and with intuitive sagacity compared by the natives with its congener the horse, assigned to it by modern science. It was only after repeated attempts and reverses that the authority of Spain was at length extended to the district of Peten, under Martin de Ursua, in 1697. The Indian name of the island, Tayasal, was changed to Nuestra Señora de los Remedios y San Pablo, but its ancient appellation is still retained in a queer

kind of association as Remedios-Peten. Among the many wonders and beauties of this strange country, M. Morelet found an ample field for study and exploration, recruiting his shattered health and cultivating a knowledge of the people and their language. The children of the town were adroitly organized by him into a band for bringing in birds, insects, lizards, and all living things within their reach. A crocodile three yards long was brought to him alive, which, after vainly attempting to poison it with arsenic, and barely escaping death from the creature's agonized fury, he at length disposed of by means of a noose, aided by his faithful attendant Morin. He brought the skin to Paris, and was honoured by its being called, as a novel species, *Crocodilus Moreleti*.

From Flores our traveller pursued his way in a south-eastern direction to Dolores, which he is mistaken, Mr. Squier shows, in confounding with the town of that name discovered by the Spaniards in 1695, the site of which is now forgotten. The present city is described as the most prosperous of all the settlements in the district. With the exception perhaps of San Luis, none were found by M. Morelet more rich in natural productions. The climate forms a happy mean between the burning heat of the plains and the chill of the mountain ranges. San Luis is a paradise for the conchologist. Reptiles abound in a confusion more welcome to the naturalist than to the native wayfarer. The fifty leagues of forest from San Luis to Cahabon are impassable for horses or mules, and there is nothing for it but to trust to Indian porters or palanquin-bearers, who have for security to be kept locked up in gaol till the hour of starting, as the sole preventive to their getting drunk, half the pay being given in advance. This universal native weakness was shown by the entire population breaking out in the Governor's temporary absence into a grand carousal. Men, women, and children, guards and prisoners, all were staggering and roaring about before the close of day. The guides, when they did start, turned out wiry and enduring little fellows, carrying two hundredweight a-piece from a band passing round the forehead. They prudently carried no spirits with them, for fear of fatal mishaps upon the march. Once, however, fairly in the trackless forest, our traveller found himself with Morin and his faithful watchdog Fida deserted by the treacherous guides, who had struck up a base conspiracy with certain roving savages of the woods. Luckily a kind of man-Friday fell in the way, by whose good offices, backed by copious peace-offerings of rum, the deserters were brought back to the despairing party. On the thirteenth day the cry of "The Savannahs!" from the foremost guides once more announced to the foot-worn procession, literally blinded by excess of light, a relief from the growing and perilous thralldom of the forest, and a glimpse as of a new world. In the centre of an immense panorama, a confused and undefinable maze of hills, valleys, and savannahs, stood perched upon a group of hills the town of Cahabon. In the far background could be traced the dim peaks of the great Cordilleras. To our enthusiastic traveller the scene had all the attractions of the promised land which gladdened the eyes of the prophets of old. Instead of rude and ungovernable barbarians, as he had been led by report to expect, he was surprised to find the inhabitants of this quaint and primitive city not materially worse than their neighbours of the same blood. The efforts of the Dominican missionaries had to a certain extent reclaimed these wild children of the forest, and impressed upon them a degree of discipline and culture, the Christian basis of which can be regarded after all but as a slight modification of paganism. The inherent idleness of the Indian race is corrected, as under the Jesuits in Brazil, by the rigid exaction of labour on behalf of the Church or public works, each man or woman being in turn obliged to work in daily turns at the orders of the Alcalde—a custom prevailing still not only in Cahabon, but also in San Augustin Lanquin and San Pedro Carcha.

With the relaxation of discipline consequent upon the emancipation of the colonies, the prosperity and good order, together with the population of the city, have of late undergone decline. The parish of Cahabon, which fifty years ago numbered upwards of 4,000 souls, now contains scarcely 3,000. The state of the Indians is described as one of feverish discontent, which might any day break out into open and savage independence. A strange sight to European eyes is a population of this extent, in which there are no professional mechanics, nor any class corresponding to that of skilled artisans. The petty commerce of the place extends to scarcely more than the bare necessities of life. As at Peten, there are no title-deeds to property, yet the rights of inheritance are respected and are transmitted without question from generation to generation. The Cahabon natives are taken by M. Morelet to belong to a different race from the Mayas, though he confesses himself puzzled to assign to them their right nationality. His authority on matters of ethnology is justly explained by Mr. Squier to fall short of that due to his knowledge of natural history. The evidence of language is naturally the most conclusive in questions of this kind. And the Quec-chi dialect, which is spoken in Cahabon, Lanquin, San Pedro Carcha, Coban, and San Juan, in Vera Paz, and in Chinautla and Mixco, in the department of Guatemala, forms one only of the numerous idioms of which the Tzendal in Maya may be taken as the radix. The anonymous author whose notes from time to time throw much light upon M. Morelet's text regards the Maya language as most closely connected with the Kachiquel, which with the Zutugil, Quiché and Maya constituted the four great divisions of the *lingua madre* of the early civilized races of Guatemala, Chiapa

and Yucatan. Much remains still to be done for the elucidation of the remote history of these mysterious tribes. But a faithful and intelligent report of what still characterizes their posterity and attests their ancient grandeur has a value of its own. And such a value belongs, whatever its shortcomings in point of scientific depth or fulness, to M. Morelet's pleasant tale of travel.

#### MISS AUSTEN'S LADY SUSAN.\*

MR. AUSTEN LEIGH has brought out a second edition of his Memoir of Miss Austen, and has added to it some unfinished specimens of his aunt's writings. The additions to his book consist mainly of a story written in the form of letters, and called *Lady Susan*; of an unfinished novel which the editor has entitled *The Watsons*; of some fragments of a tale which was broken off by Miss Austen's death, and of a cancelled chapter in *Persuasion*. The pieces now given to the world for the first time are well worth publication, not merely for their historical, but for their intrinsic interest. Miss Austen is one of the few novelists whose popularity rests on a more solid and permanent foundation than the fashion of the day. These little sketches of life and character have been buried for half a century, yet we feel that they interest us, not merely because they show us the kind of thing which delighted our mothers and grandmothers, but because in their essentials they are as true of the English society of to-day as of the English society of fifty years ago. And it is no mean praise of them to say that, slight and fragmentary as they are, they do no discredit to the reputation of an authoress whose published works owe so much of their charm to their exquisite finish.

The first place in importance among the remains is undoubtedly due to *Lady Susan*, both because it is the only one which is finished, and because it is in some respects quite unlike anything else that Miss Austen is known to have written, and by its very unlikeness throws some light on her characteristic peculiarities. The key to Miss Austen's theory of art is to be found in *Northanger Abbey*. It is the earliest and least matured of her novels; but its biographical interest almost makes up for its inferiority as a work of art. In her later books the individuality of the artist is lost in her work, in this she lays bare her motives and objects in writing. It tells us that it was the spirit of contradiction, the spirit of reaction against the perverted tastes of the day, that first prompted her to write. What Mitford was to Grote, that Mrs. Radcliffe was to Miss Austen. She might have described herself as the irreconcilable foe of sensationalism, if that ugly word had been coined in her day. Her natural good taste showed her the extravagance, her fine sense of humour showed her the absurdity, her accurate powers of observation convinced her of the falsity, of the works of fiction which were popular in her generation, as their congeners are popular in ours. As we read *Northanger Abbey* we see the bright, keen-witted girl flinging aside her *Mysteries of Udolpho*, and resolving to try whether it were not possible to write a book which should be interesting without being unnatural, and to bring back fiction to the real life of which it professed to be a copy. "What do I know, or, for the matter of that, what does Mrs. Radcliffe know, about mediæval castles and robber chiefs and clanking chains? All I know is that the people among whom I live never meet with the adventures which occur to the ordinary lot of mortals in novels; and yet to watch their ways and talk supplies me with an inexhaustible fund of amusement. Let us see whether it will not amuse the world as much as it does myself." This is the constant undercurrent which runs through *Northanger Abbey*, and which makes the book too controversial, and, in fact, too much of a parody to be entirely satisfactory as a novel. In Miss Austen's later works the controversial aspect is disguised (though here and there, especially in *Sense and Sensibility*, the old satirical vein crops out conspicuously), but the fundamental theory is steadily worked out. We are transported to no distant scene or time. The characters to whom we are introduced are those among whom we have lived all our lives; their adventures—if that is not too strong a term—are what happen to any of us; their sayings and doings are just those which make up the unchronicled items of our daily existence. In fact, the incidents are so commonplace that we sometimes wonder why we take pleasure in hearing their narration. Why should we take the trouble to read the tittle-tattle of Highbury conversation, or the disjointed rigmarole of the worthy Miss Bates, when they would bore us horribly in real life? The answer is to be found partly in the pleasure that is given by the contemplation of accurate painting, however uninteresting may be the original; partly in the fact that the conversations, natural as they seem, so far differ from real life that the dull people are never suffered to prose uninterruptedly, and there is usually some fresh, original girl present, some Lizzy Bennet, to give piquancy and point to the remarks; partly in the constant development of character which is going on beneath our eyes, and to which every incident and speech is made subordinate; and partly in the delicate vein of irony which runs through all the delineations, which reminds the reader that he is outside all this fussy talk and these petty excitements, and gives him the same kind of amusement as one experiences whilst watching, from some quiet corner, a num-

ber of grown-up and apparently rational beings going, with serious and even painful demeanour, through the complicated and, to all appearance, meaningless evolutions of the "Lancers." It is only by the exercise of the subtlest art that Miss Austen, while renouncing the obvious modes of stimulating sympathy and exciting interest, avoids being dull, and prevents her miniature-painting from degenerating into a lifeless photograph. For not only are the incidents commonplace, but the morals are conventional. Catherine Morland learns that a country-house may be called an abbey without having any tragic or mysterious associations, and that its proprietor may succeed in being extremely disagreeable without having been guilty of any monstrous crime. A painful disillusion shows Marianne Dashwood that if a girl is gifted with sensitive or romantic feelings she had better keep them under control and disguise them from the public gaze; and finally, after her brief period of romance is over, she puts up very quietly with a husband of forty. Emma Woodhouse is taught that when a young lady attempts to control the destinies of those around her she not unfrequently places herself in a ridiculous, if not in a disagreeable, position. And the general conclusion is that the world is made up of very ordinary mortals, who act in a very ordinary way, and that the best way to secure happiness is neither to expect nor to attempt anything unusual. This philosophy produces an art which portrays the surface of human life with admirable fidelity, but it is essential to its success that it should not attempt to penetrate beneath the surface. Ninety-nine per cent. of the civilized human race live for ninety-nine-hundredths of their lives much in the way which Miss Austen describes. It is only when an exceptional passion is excited, or an exceptional person comes among them, that the even tenor of their course is disturbed. Against both these contingencies Miss Austen takes due precautions. Not that her heroes or heroines are passionless. The passion of love is supposed to be a necessary preliminary to every respectable marriage, and as such could hardly be omitted from an orthodox and well-conducted novel. But love, as portrayed by Miss Austen, is a deity of much propriety, not to say tameness. In the gentleman's breast his influence is largely tempered by a proper regard to settlements, and in that of the young lady, to the secrets of which we are more intimately admitted, he stirs a coy and fluttering hope, occasionally dashed by intervals of very mitigated despair. As for exceptional persons or incidents, they do not often come forward to trouble the quiet country-house life of which the chief excitement is caused by the county ball or a trip to Bath.

Now in the sketch entitled *Lady Susan* Miss Austen has to some extent departed from these rules. *Lady Susan* belongs to the type of heroine which abounds in novels of a sensational character. Little as we should guess it from her name, she is a gay young widow of thirty-five, with the appearance of twenty-five; witty, lovely, and fascinating, but in reality a selfish, heartless, unprincipled coquette. When we are first introduced to her she has just left a house which she has, in point of fact, made too hot to hold her; for she has by her very equivocal relations to the master of the house driven its mistress into a fury of jealousy, and has at the same time successfully deprived their daughter of her lover. Under these circumstances she finds it convenient to take up her abode for a time with her late husband's brother, whose marriage to his present wife she had formerly done her best to break off, a circumstance which does not recommend her in the eyes of her hostess. However, she triumphantly establishes herself in her brother-in-law's house, disarms opposition by the charm of her manner, and drives her sister-in-law's family to distraction by entangling in her toils that lady's brother, an amiable young man who had started with a violent prejudice against her. At the same time she is carrying on her liaison with her former lover, and trying to bully her daughter into a marriage with a man whom she detests. Here are all the materials for a very pretty catastrophe, and it is easy to fancy the widespread ruin which, in the hands of a skilful novelist, this charming siren would be allowed to accomplish. Under Miss Austen's treatment, however, nothing of this kind occurs. Events clear themselves at the critical moment, the amiable young man is extracted from the mess into which he has got himself, and the siren herself meets with no worse fate than that of being married to a wealthy fool, whose future life, we have reason to infer, she made exceedingly uncomfortable. This determination to avoid a tragedy, even when all its elements have been combined, is very characteristic of Miss Austen. Not less characteristic is her choice of her heroine's name. Writers of fiction have one great advantage over real godfathers and godmothers, that they know beforehand the physical and mental characteristics of the being whom they name, and there is no danger of their Blanche turning out a brunette, or their Angelina a scold. Miss Austen carries out her theory of studiously shunning the romantic and the commonplace nowhere more resolutely than in her nomenclature; her heroines bear no feudal surnames, and are not even allowed to wear prefixes as pretentious as Evelina or Cecilia, but step forward as plain Elizabeth Bennet and Fanny Price. And it was doubtless in a spirit of playful perversity, based on feelings of the same kind, that even when she had so far deserted her usual types as to draw the character of a dangerous coquette, she chose to christen her by a name which for some reason or another has come to be peculiarly associated with the useful and homely virtues. In an age in which the correspondence even of young ladies is becoming profoundly modified by cheap postage, frequent deliveries, and halfpenny cards, the epistolary form has grown to be less and less suitable for fiction.

\* *A Memoir of Jane Austen*. By her Nephew, J. E. Austen Leigh. Second Edition. To which is added "*Lady Susan*," and Fragments of two other Unfinished Tales by Miss Austen. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1871.



Even in our grandmothers' more copious and formal days it was not without its awkwardnesses as a vehicle of narrative. But in this little sketch Miss Austen has made it admirably subservient to the end which she had in view, that of exposing the different sides of a double character. Nothing can be more skilful than the way in which the series of letters is made to present successively Lady Susan's hollow professions of amity to the brother-in-law of whose hospitality she wishes to avail herself, her cynical revelations of her true objects to her confidante, the distrust and anxiety of her hostess, and the hostility, gradual enthrallment, and final disenchantment of Mr. De Courcy.

The unfinished story which follows *Lady Susan* is written in Miss Austen's most characteristic vein. The Watsons are a large family with limited means, living near a little country town. One of the daughters, Emma, had been adopted by a wealthy uncle, with whom she had always lived, but her uncle's sudden death, followed at no long interval by an imprudent second marriage of her aunt, has robbed her of her prospects of affluence and of her adopted home, and thrown her back upon her own family. She has returned to find herself an unwelcome addition to a family already overstocked, whose characters had unhappily not escaped the sordid influences of poverty, and whose ways and thoughts were utterly uncongenial to her own. The scene opens with the winter assembly of the town of D—, which was on this occasion to be graced by the presence of the local magnate, Lord Osborne, and his family. Emma Watson, who has just returned home, is apparently the belle of the ball. She is honoured by the admiration of Lord Osborne, and also of a certain Mr. Tom Musgrave, one of his lordship's satellites, who has earned the reputation in the neighbourhood of being a most dangerous lady-killer, and who would have been described by Miss Steele as a "vastly smart beau." But to Emma's more cultivated taste, the fascinations which to her sisters had been irresistible, appeared in their true light as forward and pretentious vulgarity. From some hints in the opening chapters we are led to infer that she is destined to be mated to one of those respectable and gentlemanly young clergymen in whom Miss Austen delights. However, the story was never destined to be finished. Why it was left unfinished we do not know, but Mr. Austen Leigh hazards a very plausible conjecture that "the author became aware of the evil of having placed her heroine too low, in such a position of poverty and obscurity as, though not necessarily connected with vulgarity, has a sad tendency to degenerate into it; and, therefore, like a singer who has begun on too low a note, she discontinued the strain."

A few fragments are given from the novel on which Miss Austen was engaged at the time of her death. Its scene is laid at Sanditon, "a village on the Sussex coast, just struggling into notoriety as a bathing-place, under the patronage of the two principal proprietors of the parish, Mr. Parker and Lady Denham." The fragments are introductory sketches illustrative of the characters of these two important personages, and of their respective families. The characters are but just dressed, and the movement of the story has scarcely begun.

The chapter in *Persuasion*, of which that given in these remains was the rejected alternative, is probably the best known in all Miss Austen's works. It will be remembered that the interest of the story hangs on the difficulty which a young lady finds in letting her lover know, on his return after eight years' absence, that, though she had been persuaded into rejecting the offer of his hand from motives of prudence, she loved him then and loves him still. No one can forget the highly wrought and intensely dramatic scene in the library, where Captain Wentworth overhears some scraps of a conversation in which Anne Elliott, while maintaining the superior constancy of woman's love by words unintelligible except to one who knew her secret, unconsciously reveals the state of her own affections. In the original draught of the chapter the misunderstanding is removed in a somewhat simpler manner. Captain Wentworth has been entrusted with the extremely awkward commission of informing Miss Elliott that, in case she and her cousin, to whom she was believed to be engaged, wished to reside at Kellynch Hall, as had been rumoured, her sister and her husband, then occupying the place as tenants, would at once resign their lease. Miss Elliott's denial of her engagement brings about the necessary explanations on both sides. The scene is described with all Miss Austen's charm of truthful and graceful delineation, and shows how excellent is even what she considered her second best.

We have said enough of the contents of this book to show that it is one which cannot be passed over by any genuine admirer of Miss Austen's works.

#### FROUDE'S SHORT STUDIES.—SECOND SERIES.\*

MR. FROUDE may be read with pleasure, if not with profit, except when his ill luck leads him to meddle with history or theology. Theology puts him out of temper; history leads him into those quagmires into which it has a way of leading people who venture to meddle with it without understanding it. Mr. Froude is a memorable example that a man may write twelve volumes of so-called history without showing a glimpse of the

historical spirit, and without ever letting us feel quite certain whether the whole thing is or is not a gigantic joke. At the end of Mr. Froude's history we are still not quite certain whether the great paradox of King Harry is not a conscious paradox, in which a clever man has been trying how far he could get people to believe him, while he has himself been laughing at them in his sleeve all the time. The Essays, we think, settle the matter. On the whole, we think that Mr. Froude really is in earnest, and that he really believes the doings of his hero to be all right. It is plain that he has convictions. He has views, for instance, about the colonies, about the degeneracy of the present age, about Ireland—views which, whether we agree with them or not, are clearly put forth with all good faith and earnestness. And no one ever denied that Mr. Froude, when he takes pains and does not get into a namby-pamby fit, can write clear and attractive English, and that he has the special gift of telling a story. We accept, then, his Essays as in themselves agreeable, if not very profound or instructive reading, and as clearing up the great difficulty about the History. We accept all that Mr. Froude has written—*Lives of Saints*, *Nemesis of Faith*, panegyric of Henry the Eighth—as having been written in sober earnest. We are perhaps not bound to accept all as being capable of being reconciled with one another; it may be enough if we accept them as successive phases of faith, each setting forth Mr. Froude's honest convictions at the time. We must therefore apply the same judgment of charity to another writing of his, which appears in the volume now before us. Some of our readers may perhaps remember an article of Mr. Froude's which appeared in *Fraser's Magazine* somewhat more than a year ago, and which was noticed at the time in these columns.\* This was headed "A Bishop of the Twelfth Century," and gave the world Mr. Froude's notions of St. Hugh of Lincoln, the result of his reading of the "Magna Vita" edited by Mr. Dimock. This article appears again as one of the essays in the present volume. Now had Mr. Froude simply reprinted his article as it at first appeared, we should simply have inferred, however painful might be the thought, that he had never come across the article which we meant as an answer to what was practically a challenge on Mr. Froude's part to all the world to disprove his accuracy. But he has altered one or two things, seemingly, if we may venture so to hint, in deference to the remarks which we then made. We are therefore bound to believe that, wherever Mr. Froude has not made any change, he seriously, advisedly, and after due consideration holds that he was right in what he wrote last year. It is therefore worth while to see what Mr. Froude's state of mind still is on several points of history, geography, and the construing of Latin.

First of all, let us congratulate Mr. Froude on bringing down the Count of Avalon and the Archbishop of Grenoble from the higher ranks to which he had himself raised them, and leaving them in the humbler sphere of ordinary noble and ordinary bishop in which history places them. Marry! this is somewhat. It is somewhat, too, that Mr. Froude has left out his queer statement about Hugh going to "Lincoln to be anointed," though at the expense of leaving out the facts that he was consecrated in London and installed at Lincoln—facts which are almost necessary to the right understanding of what immediately follows. For this improvement on the part of Mr. Froude, this happy divergence into the paths of accuracy, does not last very long. We get, directly after, the story of the Archdeacon of Canterbury demanding what Mr. Froude is pleased to call "consecration fees." We discharged our own humble function by pointing out that there was nothing about "consecration fees" in the matter, and that "cathedra" did not mean "cathedral," but that from which the "ecclesia cathedralis" takes its name, the throne or *Bishopstool*. It is then Mr. Froude's deliberate conviction, on second thoughts, that he was right in this matter and that we were wrong. Still we cannot see our way to construing "Incathedratus in ecclesia sua" anyhow except "being installed in his own church," a ceremony which it was the business of the Archdeacon of Canterbury to perform. Mr. Froude might surely have remembered that consecration and installation are two very different things. We remember a quiet household where an Archdeacon had just arrived being not a little flustered by the news that no less a person than the Archbishop was come. Surely Mr. Froude's mind is not in the same state of confusion as to the functions of the greater and the smaller dignitary. His way of treating this story implies, though it does not set forth in so many words, a want of susceptibility to such geographical subtleties as the distinction between Lincoln and London. The geography of lesser places is determined, by the results of Mr. Froude's second thoughts, not to be worthy of any correction or attention whatever. When the biographer states a thing to have happened at Brackley, Mr. Froude still makes it happen at Lincoln. When John and Hugh go to Chinon, Mr. Froude still sends them to Fontevrault, and every "miles de Episcopatu Lincolnensi" is still held by Mr. Froude to be a knight of the Bishops. The "*Castrum quod Beauford appellatur*" is still "*Beaufort Abbey*," and Angers is still by implication in Normandy. "*Roche d'Andeli*" is still simply "*Roche d'Andeli*"; we fear that we have not stirred up Mr. Froude to a visit to Château Gaillard. Hugh's "*consobrinus*" William is still his brother, but it is something to find that Mr. Froude allows that the "*Holland*" in which he figures is "per-

\* *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. Second Series. London: Longmans & Co. 1871.

\* See *Saturday Review*, March 19, 1870.

haps Holland in Lincolnshire." As the mention of Holland comes in a story in which Lincoln, Holland, and Northampton appear as different stages of one episcopal journey, it would be a very eccentric course indeed which should take either the Bishop or his kinsman into the Holland beyond sea.

In the like sort Mr. Froude's absurd misunderstanding of the story about the deer for the installation feast, his direct contradiction of his own authority as to the buildings at Witham, appear again uncorrected in the new form of the Essay. So does the angel, whose personal presence in the story is due, not to Hugh, who had no taste for miracles, nor yet to his biographer, but to Mr. Froude himself. Here, it may be, Mr. Froude has fallen back upon his former self; he has gone back to the days when he told of his saintly hero "all that we know and more than we know, but not so much as the angels know"—a mode of writing history which in one way belongs to an earlier phase of Mr. Froude's mental growth, but which, as regards the standard of historical truth which it implies, is very much on a level with the way in which he has written alike of King Henry and of St. Hugh.

We foresee the defence which will at once rise to the lips of Mr. Froude's admirers. All these things are trifles, petty details, which do not matter which way they are told. What does it matter whether a certain not eminent man was Hugh's brother or his cousin? What does it matter whether a certain not important fact happened at Lincoln or at Brackley? In itself it does not matter; that is to say, the value of the stories would have been just the same if they had happened as Mr. Froude says they happened, and not as they really did happen. But as regards the truth of history and the trust which we place in our historian it matters very much. He who is not faithful in the small matter cannot be trusted in the great. Mr. Froude, writing from a single well-known authority, writing about well-known persons, places, and ceremonies, shows at every step that he cannot be trusted. He cannot tell the simplest story without misrepresenting the meaning of his author, without bringing in some confusion as to persons, places, and offices. When his mistakes are pointed out, he alters a few, but leaves most of them unaltered. That is to say, he blunders over again with his eyes open. We ask, as we asked last year, what right has a man who thus deals with a single plain document which every scholar can test for himself to ask us to accept a single fact on the faith of a crowd of documents far away which hardly any of us have the means of testing?

From our point of view, and with reference to Mr. Froude's greater works, this paper on St. Hugh is the most important in the volume. As for the show-speeches at St. Andrews, they are show-speeches, and that is about all. If they were to be reprinted, we suppose that it was right to reprint them as they were actually spoken. But as for the Inaugural Address, with its monstrous misstatements as to the actual course of study in the English Universities, a mind which was scrupulous about accuracy would either have forbore republishing the speech or would at least have added a note by way of correction. Mr. Hallam, on one or two smaller occasions than this, showed his true greatness of soul by going through this kind of voluntary penance. Even Mr. Lowe, though he does not bring himself to withdraw his groundless charges, has at least the grace not to repeat them after he has learned better. Mr. Froude has no such scruples. He is not ashamed again to print, without correction or modification, such monstrous statements as that "a young man going to Oxford learns the same things which were taught two centuries ago," and that "the Universities confine their honours to the old Latin and Greek." In another man, who had the ordinary means of knowing what goes on in his own day in his country, we should call sayings like these wilful calumnies. But Mr. Froude has a privilege. Whether he is dealing with King Harry, with St. Hugh, or with the present state of Oxford and Cambridge, the same inherent habit of mind follows him everywhere. It is not so much that he wilfully despises truth of statement as that he cannot be made to understand what truth of statement is. As historian, as essayist, as orator at St. Andrews, we freely give him the benefit of invincible ignorance.

Mr. Froude's other Essays can, as we have already hinted, be read with more satisfaction. His lamentations on the degeneracy of the age are in intrinsic value much the same as all lamentations on the degeneracy of the age have been in all ages. It is always easy to find points in which this or that age stands at a disadvantage as compared with some earlier age. The process is always curious, and, when carried on with discretion, it may even be instructive and practical. But it is going rather too far when some impulsive censor of his own generation would have us believe that the notion of human progress is all a mistake, and that the world is really going backwards instead of forwards. When Mr. Froude takes up his parable on this theme, we give him just that amount of attention which we give to any other prophet of evil—that is, the chances are that out of his lamentation we may incidentally reap some practical instruction. Mr. Froude finds it easy to show particular points in which Englishmen were better off in the seventeenth or the sixteenth century than they are now. If we can find out the causes of our partial degeneracy, and if we can find the means to amend it without taking to a retrograde course altogether, Mr. Froude's mourning over the good old times will not be without use. We may or we may not think that Mr. Froude's favourite apprenticeship was a good system; we may or we may not agree with his doctrines about

the colonies or about foreign policy, but they are at least put forth clearly, earnestly, and in an agreeable shape; the speculations of a clever writer like Mr. Froude will not always be either just or profound, but they will always supply some matter for thought. When we come to his panegyric on the worldly clergy of the last century as compared with the more religiously-minded clergy of the present, we are not so certain; he is now getting on dangerous ground. Theology is Mr. Froude's red rag, and he begins to paw and toss the moment he sees it; so we tremble a little when we come to an essay on the "Condition and Prospects of Protestantism." But when he tells us that "the work of the Reformation was done when speculative opinion was declared free," we know where we are. No doubt the Reformation has in the end led to the freedom of speculative opinion. But no amount of Mr. Froude's declamation will persuade us that anybody in the sixteenth century, unless possibly Akbar and William the Silent, at all maintained freedom of speculation as a principle. Papist, Anglican, Puritan, all strove to set up their own systems and to forbid all others. This is how the history of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries appears to us, but this may perhaps be owing to our sharing in that "ignorance of modern history which still accompanies our highest education." We comfort ourselves by thinking that one part of modern history is surely to know what goes on under our own eyes. We again fall back on the plea of invincible ignorance to excuse such a passage as the following:—

Such a phenomenon, we repeat, can only be explained by the system of instruction at our English Universities, where we are taught accurately the constitution of Servius Tullius, but where we never hear of the Act of Supremacy, and find it an open question whether Latimer was not a raving fanatic, and Cranmer a sycophant and a scoundrel.

As for the character of Cranmer or of any one else, it must, as a matter of inference from facts, always be in some sort an open question. But stronger hands than those of Mr. Froude are making Cranmer and his contemporaries their own. We can leave the controversies of the sixteenth century to them. But we should be well pleased if the world could go back only so far that Mr. Froude might be examined on the Act of Supremacy in the Oxford schools. We should be better pleased still to know what kind of answer he would make if hard pressed as to Bills of Attainder and *peine forte et dure*, as to the relation of the Principality of Orange to the Empire, or as to the geography of the episcopal cities on the Severn.

#### BLACKIE'S COLLOQUIA GRÆCA.\*

THE proposal to expedite and improve the teaching of what are ordinarily called the dead languages, through the medium of oral conversation, is not by any means novel. It had a strong advocate ages ago, in Erasmus; it was recommended and practically encouraged by the Society of Arts in the early years of its existence. But the present need of every available resource for abridging and simplifying the process of acquiring these accepted fundamentals of a liberal education has evoked an enthusiastic and ardent reformer of abuses, and one too whose utterances, whether on topics of political, social, or educational change, are seldom devoid of interest, never of entertainment. Undismayed by the scanty success he has had during thirty years in Scottish Universities in trying to teach the dead languages conversationally as much at least as by book and paper-work, Professor Blackie comes forward in print to urge the more general use of the *immediate* process of oral interchange of ideas in Greek and Latin, instead of, or as a supplement to, the *intermediate* process of previous translation into English. He insists on the importance of making the ear of the learner directly sensible, in the acquirement of dead languages, of an appeal from the tongue of the teacher; he contends that the ear must be the direct recipient of dead as of living languages, of the scholar's Greek equally with the fluent German of the *Fraulein*, "the memory serving as a storehouse, and the judgment as dispenser of the stores"; and he believes that the time has come when all obstacles, whether arising out of the "laziness, carelessness, and conservatism of teachers," or of the shyness (Horace's "*infans pudor*," it would seem) of pupils, must be boldly met and dissipated. "The inadequate results of the present methods of classical training are," he says, "universally complained of; the claims of rival subjects are becoming every day more clamorous and more just; in mere self-defence the advocates of ancient learning must study to avail themselves of methods at once more natural, more scientific, and more expeditious." In other words, we are to see whether after all there is not a royal road to that most wholesome and most difficult of acquirements, the mastery of Greek and Latin; and in the book before us Professor Blackie not only points the way in a preface dictated by his own characteristic enthusiasm, but also furnishes helps for it in a series of dialogues about all sorts of subjects which show his familiarity with the best conversational Greek—that of Plato, Aristophanes, and Lucian—and supply a type of the kind of oral exercise most likely to become popular with students, and to break down the barriers of their natural reserve. This latter part of Professor Blackie's work will possess most interest for teachers and

\* *Colloquia Græca*. Greek and English Dialogues for use in Schools and Colleges. By John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. London and Edinburgh: Macmillan & Co. 1871.



pupils, to whom it cannot but prove as suggestive as it is entertaining; but our concern is rather with the preface, as containing propositions which require to be examined, and assumptions with regard to which it is of importance to ascertain how far they are to be accepted. We address ourselves therefore chiefly to the preface; and, having premised that we are by no means adverse to the introduction of oral conversation in Greek and Latin as a subsidiary or collateral means of imparting those languages, provided care be taken that the accuracy which is born of reading and writing is not neglected meanwhile, and that the acquisition is not suffered to be of that sort which an English child picks up from a French *bonne*, or of the normal school-girl's conversation in the "Donnez-moi le candlestick" fashion, it occurs to us to inquire, in the first place, whether—in the admitted absence until now of the conversational element in Greek and Latin teaching—things have really been quite as bad as they seem to Professor Blackie as regards the unsatisfactoriness of present methods.

It would seem that he deems these lacking in "the living appeal to the ear of the learner from the tongue of the teacher, with direct reference to objects in which the learner feels natural and familiar interest"; and in the Sixth Dialogue one of the interlocutors counsels the other "to take his advice, and in acquiring Greek to use his ears and his tongue chiefly, and not merely his eyes"—that is to say, we suppose, "to speak it as well as to read it." Now it may be admitted that in schools the range of Greek reading is commonly so limited, partly owing to the difficulty of stretching a time-table *ad infinitum*, that a sufficiently copious and diversified vocabulary is generally to seek; and the stimulus of having to meet the challenge of conversationalists would in this case be of service in enlarging the store of words and phrases treasured in the memory. But we cannot say that we recognise as a reality within our experience "the solitary individual" who appears to be the Professor's type of the reading—not speaking—student, "getting up the book form of a language as it meets the eye, without concerning himself with the living reality of the vocal organism"; nor do we know where such a phenomenon is to be found on this side of the border, except among the very few self-taught students who have no means of attrition with tutor or fellow-pupils. Surely the usual course of good Greek and Latin teaching in England does—without resort to conversation—daily exert and practise the living appeal, and bring the ear and tongue into contact, when a pupil repeats so many lines of Homer or Greek play, subject to his master's criticism; or when, after translating a piece of Greek or Latin into English on paper, he has to retranslate it orally into the original language. This latter exercise is about the most valuable, with a view to accuracy, that can be devised; and it should be added that in this as well as in the preliminary reading aloud of a passage before proceeding to construe it, which ought on no account to be omitted, abundant opportunity arises for the tutor or master to correct mispronunciations and false quantities. From a remark of Professor Blackie's, in p. vii., we are led to infer that, at least in the Northern University of which he is writing, the custom of the students, before he routed them out of it, was to go through "a process of translation through the English, when they wished to express their thoughts in either of the dead languages." But though this may be, and no doubt is, the habit of dull students, we can say from our personal experience that such was not the custom of boyish Latin theme-writers at an English public school thirty years ago, although they contrived tolerably well to "say what they ought to say" in Latin at first hand, without the help of a readiness acquired by practice in systematic conversation. This at least would meet the case of thinking in a dead language, which does not necessarily presuppose conversational practice; while as to the enjoyment of balanced Greek and Latin versification and the roll of classic prose which, according to Professor Blackie, can have no meaning or force except when addressed to the ear (so that we must conform our rules to the practice of our ears, and round our periods according to the demonstrable orthoepy and rhythmical harmony of the dead languages), it is certain that in most seminaries of really sound learning this is ensured by the constant reading aloud of what is written, and by exercises of repetition and retranslation.

Again, it is easily conceded that the conversational method is that upon which we proceed in the early acquirement of our mother-tongue, and, yet more, that the security for accomplishing the same process more systematically and expeditiously, in the scholastic teaching of the dead languages, with the safeguard of rules and plans, is not inconsiderable. And yet we confess that it is a shock to our classical nerves to hear a Greek Professor propound so dangerous a doctrine as "fluency first and preciseness afterwards," and modify Bacon's well-known aphorism, to suit the case of young men learning a dead language, in this wise, "Speaking makes both a full and ready man; reading and writing within the limits usually practised at schools under the correction of constant analysis and construction make an accurate man." For we cannot help fearing that, without the nicest balancing of the exercise which is to ensure fluency with that which is to guarantee accuracy, the full and ready man whom the Professor aims at turning out may possibly be the master of a large, rough and ready, but at the same time inelegant and inaccurate, vocabulary. The old method of reading and writing must be the best and surest way of enforcing consideration for the grammar and syntax rules; and, without the constant vigilance of a very trustworthy and superior teacher, there would be infinite peril of the spoken Greek of young students manifesting a palpable deficiency of

articles and particles, and of their conversation partaking of unmisgivable dogginess. No doubt Professor Blackie's object is not to supersede but to supplement; no doubt, too, he would guard his practice with step-by-step collateral work; but it seems to us that extreme caution is needful in the acceptance of the teaching of his preface, because it too exclusively regards the conversational method, which is only one of the oral modes of acquiring the dead languages, and because it unintentionally exalts fluency above accuracy. A rich and copious vocabulary is a great acquisition for a young Greek scholar, and it is capital fun to contemplate the Professor's ideal of the work of the Dialogues, which "plunge" tiroes "into the living element of Greek, in which they may learn to plash about joyously like young porpoises in a sunny sea." Very pretty and exciting! Only, if there should by mishap be defect or failure of those collateral exercises to ensure accuracy for which we contend first and foremost, a risk arises of our young porpoises being mistaken, with some show of reason—*absit omen*—for flounders.

We have said that we acquit the Professor of any intention to make light of the old-fashioned safeguards of accuracy which have brought our Greek scholarship to the high point at which it is admitted to stand at present; and we have already declared our readiness to welcome the often-attempted introduction of conversational teaching in Greek and Latin speech, if under certain limitations and due precautions. What are the prospects of this reform being carried out? Professor Blackie writes as one who, after thirty years of long-suffering patience, and no little vexation at the vain and foolish conversation of "meagre Scottish schoolmasters," and their "fat aristocratic" Southern brothers, with their pupils in English schools, is only now beginning to feed upon hope, that eternal offspring of the human breast which is as often fallacious as justified by results. What has been hitherto is pathetically depicted in the specimen dialogue to which we have before adverted. "Do you speak Greek?" says A., in a Greek sentence (p. 31) too long for reproduction here. "Yes," says B., "I speak every day. *καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς χρῶμαι ὁσημίαι.* To whom? *πρὸς τίνα δὴ;* To myself and the Muses. *Αὐτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὰς Μούσας.*" It is now a good many years since we first heard scholars engaged in education advocating the process of speaking the dead languages in conversation with pupils, yet they still have to speak "to themselves and the Muses." And the question arises, is there any preeminently favourable opportunity for establishing this reform in teaching at the present moment? Perhaps the discussions rife about ancient pronunciation affect just now the Latin language rather than the Greek; but every one knows that there is diversity of opinion as to the correct pronunciation of the latter as well as of the former. A learned modern Greek likens our pronunciation of the ancient language of Hellas to "English beer," and his own and that of his compatriots to the "pure and honey-sweet wines of Greece"; and though we may have our own idea about the relative excellence of the two liquors, there can be no doubt that his comparison is intended to be strongly depreciatory.

At all events, there is such a rage just now for revision, reform, and reconstruction that hardly anything can be said to be certain. The classical world of England has rushed to arms to fight the battle of pronunciation, and here at least it is true, *quot homines, tot sententia*. All this will of course extend itself in time to Greek, if indeed it has not already done so; and under such circumstances even "the solitary individual who contents himself with the mere book form of a language," or the student who perforce talks it to himself and the Muses, might really be pardoned for accepting his lot with complacency. For it is hard to see when such questions will be set at rest, and pronunciation settled according to a uniform standard; and until that time arrives conversation in the Greek and Latin languages must needs be carried on subject to doubts and discouragements. Professor Blackie, indeed, says that, "if spoken in a rational way by persons studying them in this country, they would prove of no small utility to British scholars travelling abroad"; and it is conceivable that Greek conversers from his Edinburgh class-room might make themselves understood in a talk with Mr. N. Valetta, the author of a Greek treatise on "Homer's Life and Poems"; for that gentleman, in a note to the fourth chapter of the volume referred to, bestows upon ὁ πολυμαθὴς καὶ σιδάσμιος Κύριος Βλάκειος the high commendation that he teaches and recites Greek *κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν προφορὰν*. But there are Greeks and Greeks, we take it; and though our students might be safe in airing their Greek talk in the company of those "sons of the Greeks" who have set themselves to restore their corrupted language to its earlier purity, and might thereby find material help to an international standard of pronunciation, on the other hand we suspect that small benefit to the acquirement of language, idiom, or orthoepy would result from intercourse with the casual Greek fellow-traveller, or with such chance acquaintances as the "Themistocles Kakourgos" of Dr. Dasent's *Annals of an Eventful Life*. In truth the advocates of the conversational method will do well to sink the "utility-to-travelling-scholars" argument, and to fall back upon the more practical statement that they desire to bring in "Greek conversation," not as an end, but as a means. And this Professor Blackie appears to see; and so far—i.e., as a means of accelerating the learning of the dead languages, without prejudice to reading and writing as now used—we can afford to wish his plan free course.

His little manual certainly leaves nothing to be desired in its practical part. The Dialogues are preceded by two brief but sound

and lucid sections on orthoepy and idiom; and then the reader finds himself launched into conversations which are extremely amusing reading, as well as indicative of a wide and observant study of Greek literature. Appended to each of them is a useful and often curious list of additional words and phrases on the subject in hand; and if in the Dialogues themselves or in these lists the eye occasionally lights upon what seems a doubtful word, we must own that in almost every case we have found the Professor borne out by Liddell and Scott. In the Third Dialogue, for instance, *μηλόσι*, the dative plural of *μήλον* "an orchard," struck us as an uncommon word; as did also *φωτῶν* "a nursery," in Dialogue the Fifth. They have the respectable avouchment of the "Etymologicum Magnum" and the "Geoponica" respectively. *Αἰμασία* for a "stone-dyke" has a complete justification in the synonym of *Μοῖρις*, *λιθολογία*. Some words, of course, have had to be coined—e.g., *ταχυδρομίων* for a "post-office"—but it follows legitimately from *ταχυδρομῆς*, the "running postman," and the second sense of the modern Greek word *ταχυδρομία* is in Dehégue's Pocket Modern Greek and French Dictionary "poste aux lettres." Out of the Dialogue on the School and University the curious may glean not only instruction in Greek, but also particulars and data about Professor Blackie's classes and time-table. We learn too here, in passing, that "no man beats the Scotch at teaching, at gardening, or in a theological argument." But the most amusing dialogue of all is the Twenty-fifth—a dinner-party, which we are quite sure cannot be copied from life. When Sir George obeys the order "Sit you on the right hand of the hostess," and after a very long grace is induced "to fall to," the rudeness of one of his fellow-guests in remarking that "there are very few oysters in the sauce" is made an opportunity for showing with what skill the reply "Yes," as Virgil says, "apparent rari nantes in gurgite vasto," may be turned into a Greek hexameter. The same interlocutor is made to speak of a "haggis" as "velut inter ignes Luna minores," and in England would have been voted a bore for quoting at the dinner-table Homer and Phocylides. To this dialogue there is no appendix of additional words and phrases. We would suggest that in the next edition a Greek equivalent for "talking shop" should be the nucleus of such a list.

## GIRDLESTONE'S ARITHMETIC.\*

THIS work belongs to a department of science to which we do not often refer; but so decided is its superiority to ordinary arithmetical treatises, and, while adapting itself to the humblest capacity, so comprehensive is the view it affords of the laws of number, not unfrequently neglected by many who devote serious thought to the higher branches of mathematics, that it seems entitled to exceptional notice.

To criticize such a book, which moreover is large for its subject, as a whole, would be impossible, so we confine our attention to Mr. Girdlestone's chapter on "Proportion, or the Rule of Three," in which his abandonment of an old fallacious routine is especially conspicuous. We start, however, at an earlier point than that chosen by him even in his opening chapter. According to our view, it is impossible to arrive at an accurate conception of number until the truth is firmly grasped that objects to be enumerated must be like in kind, or at least must be rendered so by being mentally divested of the qualities by which they are distinguished from each other. Before, e.g., we can predicate of an elephant, a lion, and a pig, that they are three in number, we must consider them merely as individuals grouped under one common category, say mammal or quadruped. They are three mammalia or quadrupeds, having been reduced by abstraction to a condition of perfect similarity; and before the work of abstraction they were not three at all. Only in relation to a number of elephants can a single elephant, *quid* elephant, be regarded as a unit. If to our triad of quadrupeds we would add a tree in order to obtain number four, we must carry the work of abstraction still further, until we arrive at (say) the category of organized being. The three quadrupeds and the tree are four only inasmuch as they are organized beings; only on that or a similar condition. In Hegel's *Logic*, the chapters wherein the philosopher effects the transition from quality to quantity are among the most satisfactory in the book. The qualified existences have, through a dialectic process, resolved themselves into indistinguishable atoms, and here quantity begins. Viewed from the standpoint of quality, numerical distinction is no distinction at all.

If we cannot count a number of objects save on the assumption that there is no qualitative difference between them, it follows as a matter of course that we cannot compare two numbers save on the assumption that the units of which they are both composed are qualitatively identical. The ratio of three horses to four pounds is a *contradictio in adjecto*. The two groups are composed of different unities. There is, indeed, a ratio of four shillings to two pounds sterling, but we can only obtain this ratio by fixing on the pound as unity, and treating the shilling as its twentieth part, or by fixing on the shilling as a unit, twenty of which compose the pound. In the choice of the object that is to fill the important post of unity in our calculations we may (under metaphysical or theological correction)

be regarded as free agents. Our One may be an apple, or a dog, or an army, or a cardinal virtue; but by the simple act of choice we take leave for the nonce of the motley world of qualitative difference. To many readers we shall seem to have adopted a very elaborate mode of stating an obvious truism; but we doubt whether they will be found among those who have thought most seriously on the subject. Indeed, Mr. Girdlestone's chapter on the Rule of Three is virtually a continued protest against a disregard of the truths we have just propounded, by the majority of arithmetical teachers. He does not exactly touch on the deduction of quantity from quality, which we have kept in view, and hence we slightly object to his definition of unity. "Unit or unity," he says, "is the name given to that quantity which is to be reckoned as one, when other quantities of the same kind are to be measured." This definition would be perfectly exhaustive if it were confined to arithmetic as applied to the mensuration of space or time. Thus, establishing the yard as a unit, we find that of such units the mile contains 1,760; establishing the minute as a unit, we find that of such units the hour contains 60; in both the greater being measured by the lesser quantity. But when we talk of twelve men, it is somewhat a perversion of words to call one man a quantity, and thus virtually to assert that a fat unit six feet high is quantitatively identical with a thin dwarf. We would therefore supplement the definition cited above with these words, "or the object which is to be considered as one, when other objects of the same kind are to be enumerated." Mr. Girdlestone may perhaps regard our objection as hypercritical; but at all events it is only made with a view to establish the principle, which he so lucidly propounds, that in the science of quantity like can only be compared to like.

We turn to Joyce's *Arithmetic*, a work first published, we believe, early in this century, and long a sort of classic in commercial schools. The Rev. J. Joyce was a man far above the average of ordinary compilers. His "Scientific Dialogues" conveyed to young persons with admirable clearness and in a very pleasant manner such knowledge of mechanics, hydrostatics, optics, &c., as was current half a century ago, and in one of her delightful books for children Miss Edgeworth makes an intelligent boy look upon the perfect comprehension of these dialogues as the perfection of scientific wisdom. Nevertheless, let us see how the Rev. J. Joyce opens his directions for the application of the Rule of Three. "Place the given numbers," he says, "so that the first and third may be of the same kind, and the second the same as the denominator required." Now this is the very thing that ought not to be done.

We proceed to his first example—"What is the value of a pipe of wine, if 5 gallons cost 4*l.* 17*s.*?" By the application of the precept with which we have just been favoured we start thus:—

$$5 \text{ gal.} : 4:17 :: 1 \text{ pipe.}$$

As the pipe contains 126 gallons, we might as well have set down 126 as our third term at once; but if people prefer to prolong their labour by formally multiplying 1 by 126, that is a matter of taste.

We now turn to Mr. Girdlestone's definition of ratio. "Ratio is the mutual of two magnitudes of the same kind with reference to quantuplicity," and as the last is a somewhat hard word, he tells us in more familiar language that "the ratio between two quantities is determined by considering how many times the first is greater or less than the second." He goes on to declare that "proportion is the relation of equality subsisting between two ratios." Thus the ratio of 6 to 2 is equal to the ratio of 15 to 5. The four dots placed like the pipes in the four hearts or clubs are no more than the ordinary symbol of equality (=) written in another shape, the two dots being the sign of ratio. Whether we write  $6 : 2 :: 15 : 5$ , or  $6 : 2 = 15 : 5$ , is perfectly indifferent.

When the four proportional terms are all known, there is of course no problem; but if one of them is unknown, we stand in need of the Rule of Three, if we would discover its value. This Rule is simply founded on the law that in every proportion the product of the extremes is equal to the product of the mean. The scientific method therefore of going to work is to write the four terms, putting in the place of the one unknown the symbol "x," or, as Mr. Girdlestone has it, "Ans.," thereby meaning the anticipated answer to the problem. We now give Mr. Girdlestone's first example:—"If 17 barrels of beer cost 51*l.*, what number of barrels can be bought for 93*l.*?" To solve this problem he places his terms thus:—

$$17 : x :: 51 : 93,$$

and of course obtains this answer:—

$$x = \frac{17 \times 93}{51} = 31.$$

If you like, however, he allows you to write

$$\begin{aligned} & x : 17 :: 93 : 51; \\ \text{or,} & 93 : 51 :: x : 17; \\ \text{or,} & 51 : 93 :: 17 : x. \end{aligned}$$

But through all the four changes barrels must be compared with barrels and pounds with pounds.

Turning back to the old school of arithmetical teaching as represented by the Rev. J. Joyce, we find that five gallons of wine are compared to 4*l.* 17*s.*, and that the ratio between these two quantities, which are *not* measured by a common unity, is equal to the ratio between 25 gallons and an unknown number of pounds sterling. Theoretically, though not practically, the statement is

\* *Arithmetic, Theoretical and Practical*. By W. H. Girdlestone, M.A., of Christ's College, Cambridge. Second Edition. London, Oxford, and Cambridge: Rivingtons. 1870.



almost as absurd as the noted problem which required the distance from Hyde Park Corner to Michaelmas Day. With reason, therefore, does Mr. Girdlestone warn his readers carefully to avoid the statement.

17 barrels : 51*l* :: *x* barrels : 93*l*.

The fallacious rule has easily become popular, inasmuch as the order of the terms it prescribes commonly corresponds to their order in the question, and the result is precisely the same as that obtained by the correct method, the same numbers being paired together in both cases as extremes and means.

The statement of the proportion being free from absurdity, Mr. Girdlestone anticipates an objection which, on his principle, may be made to the *modus operandi* when use is made of the Rule of Three. The two extremes are to be multiplied together, and so are the two means; that is to say, 17 barrels are to be multiplied by 93*l*, and an unknown number of barrels by 51*l*. Does not the absurdity that has been pitchforked out of the statement come rushing back upon the unfortunate calculator as soon as he begins to work?

To explain away a difficulty that would never have occurred to the old school of teachers, Mr. Girdlestone remarks:—"It is to be remembered that the ratio of 51 pounds to 93 pounds is the same as the ratio of the abstract number 51 to the abstract number 93. We may therefore be supposed to consider only the abstract nominal value of the terms." The tone of this explanation is to our minds somewhat too timid and apologetic. The author's words (we are sure not his thoughts) seem to convey the notion that, while we are really doing something very absurd, we may be supposed, by some kind friend or lenient foe, to be doing something that is not absurd at all. Now there is no supposition in the matter. In applying the law of proportion on the principle so well expounded by Mr. Girdlestone, we actually take leave of concrete quantities altogether the moment our statement is completed. The statement, be it borne in mind, does not declare the ratio between certain quantities—that is already given in the problem—but the equality of two ratios. Three horses bear the same relation to four horses that three of the Seven Deadly Sins bear to the rest of their number, and they might all be put together without absurdity within the compass of one problem. Perhaps we shall make our meaning more clear if we adopt the form of statement which declares the equality of two fractions, and implicitly the truth that the numerator is to the denominator of the first fraction as the numerator is to the denominator of the second. Let us now write down the fractions with concrete quantities. By the old-fashioned plan we should have two very fantastic fractions, with barrels for numerators and pounds sterling for denominators, imaginary quantities in the strictest (though not the mathematical) sense of the word. But if we put our barrels into the numerator and denominator of one fraction, and our pounds sterling into those of the other, we merely declare the unity by which two compound quantities are measured. Or if this notion of unity be not firmly grasped, let the barrels be struck out of one fraction, and the pounds sterling out of the other, as factors respectively common to the two terms of each. It is thus obvious that in multiplying together the extremes and the means of two proportionals, we are not hypothetically, but actually, dealing with abstract quantities only.

The full value of the form of statement enforced by Mr. Girdlestone is not manifested till we come to what is commonly called the "Rule of Three Inverse." In the "Rule of Three Direct" the old plan, bad as it was, answered its purpose, and the calculator, satisfied with his correct solution of a problem, might naturally regard all theoretical objections as utterly without practical worth. So long as the increase or decrease of the quantities of one kind is accompanied by the increase or decrease of the quantities of the other kind, the dream of blissful ignorance is not disturbed. The more money we lay out the more beer we buy, and all goes on smoothly enough. But when the quantities of one kind increase, while those of the other decrease, a number of problems arise which must have frequently puzzled many a youth who otherwise may have been tolerably accomplished in the use of his pencil and slate. Of such questions we have this specimen in Mr. Girdlestone's illustrative example:—"When wheat was 16*s*. the bushel, the twopenny loaf weighed 7½ ounces; what should be the weight of the loaf when wheat is at 9*s*.?" It is clear enough that when the price of wheat rises the size of the loaf is diminished, but the student accustomed only to "direct" problems finds himself in a topsyturvy world, in which all his received notions are upset; and we have no doubt that Mr. Girdlestone, accustomed to tuition, speaks on the strength of a bitter experience when he says that we must be careful not to write *the greater : the less :: the less : the greater*—a formula which, thus stated in all its hideousness, can only awaken a thrill of horror. The fact is that the youth who thinks that barrels of beer can have a certain ratio to pounds sterling works in a routine without any principle whatever, and when forced to leave that routine is naturally befogged.

In order to tackle the so-called "indirect" problem, teachers of the old school devised a "Rule of Three Inverse." The "Rule of Three Direct" having taught us, as they said, to find for three given numbers a fourth, which was to have the same proportion to the second which the third had to the first, the doctrine of proportion being thus enunciated in a roundabout way caused by the inaccuracy of the old method of statement, the "Rule of Three Direct" was to teach us precisely the same thing, but the *modus*

*operandi* was inverted. This rule, like the other, practically answered its purpose, but it had to be learned separately, and thus the notion that there are two sorts of proportion was insinuated into the mind. Now it is the great merit of Mr. Girdlestone's plan that it gives only one rule for the solution of both kinds of questions. "Proportion," as he says, "is always necessarily direct," and the definition that four quantities are proportionals when the first is the same multiple, part or parts of the second, that the third is of the fourth, is completely exhaustive. The proposition that the first is to the third as the second is to the fourth, which is needlessly used in the old-fashioned rule, is a theorem the truth of which is a consequence of the relations expressed by the definition; but it does not enter into the definition itself. Thus there is but one Rule of Three, and the application of this commences with a statement in which the quantities of one kind are placed as the first and second terms, and those of the second kind as the third and fourth. Thus the problem referring to the price of wheat and the size of the loaf is represented in the following statement:—

16 : 9 :: *x* : 7½.

The greater number being placed before the smaller number of shillings, the weight of the heavier loaf, here the unknown quantity, is placed before the weight of the lighter one. In the problem relating to the number of barrels, and the money expended on purchasing them, the unknown was evidently greater than the known quantity of the same kind; consequently, if the smaller number was written before the greater number of pounds, it was necessary to write the known before the unknown quantity of barrels.

Confining ourselves to one section of Mr. Girdlestone's book, we have done enough to show that he is a most able expositor of the theory of arithmetic, introducing mathematical reasoning into a region where mere faith has frequently predominated—that faith, moreover, not being in an orthodox creed. Let us add that the practical is quite equal to the theoretical value of his performance. He never misses an opportunity of showing how arithmetical labour may be conveniently shortened, and not only is every one of his rules followed by abundant exercises, but he gives by way of appendix a series of Examination papers set at different institutions, ascending from the humblest requisitions to the University papers of Oxford and Cambridge. To all the questions answers are given at the end.

#### CHRONICLES OF ST. ALBAN'S.\*

MR. RILEY has here presented us with the eighth volume of his valuable series of *Chronicles of St. Alban's*. It consists of two entirely distinct portions, which, though they both profess to chronicle the events of the first ten years of the reign of Henry VI. so far as they at all concerned the Abbey, have nevertheless but little in common beyond the fact of their both having been compiled by some inmate of the house. The larger work which occupies the greater part of the present volume, and will we suppose be completed in the next, is ascribed to John de Amundesham, or, as the name came to be spelled and always probably was pronounced, Amersham. Mr. Riley thinks there is no conclusive evidence as to the name of the writer, but reserves the discussion of this point, as indeed he does all description of this manuscript and its contents, for the Introduction to his next volume, which is in progress, and which will probably be published in a few months if he continues to work as diligently as he has done for the last seven years.

The *Chronicon Rerum Gestarum in Monasterio* is very properly so entitled, and contains an account of what was going on within the walls of the Abbey, mixed up with a few other matters which are directly connected with the house. It is by far the most interesting part of the volume, but before we proceed to say anything about its contents we must say a few words about the *Annales*, which we shall take leave to call Amersham's without committing ourselves to any opinion as to the authorship. It is at least plain that they were compiled by some one who had belonged to the fraternity, and was well acquainted with its history. The manuscript is contained in the volume Claudius D. I. of the Cotton Library which has contributed so largely to this series of works. It is imperfect at the beginning, though probably there are not many leaves missing. The whole of the account of the first year of the Abbot is wanting, and the place which it ought to have occupied is filled by an imperfect description of events which belong to the third year of his incumbency. The first words of the *Annales* are from the end of the sentence which introduces the speech of Flemyng, Bishop of Lincoln, against the Abbot, John Whetehampstede, and it need scarcely be added that the discussion was concerning the rights of the Abbot as head of an exempt abbey, and therefore claiming in all things to be immediately under the Pope's jurisdiction. The discussion was carried on at the Council of Pavia in 1423, and the

\* *Chronica Monasterii S. Albani. Annales Monasterii S. Albani, a Johanne Amundesham, Monacho, ut videtur, conscripti (A.D. 1421-1440). Quibus præfigitur Chronicon Rerum Gestarum in Monasterio S. Albani (A.D. 1422-1431) a quodam auctore ignoto compilatum.* Edited by Henry Thomas Riley, M.A., of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Vol. I. Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: Longmans & Co. 1870.

first ten pages of Mr. Riley's volume, apparently corresponding to two folios of the MS., are occupied with this subject. No account is given of this transposition, which has probably originated in some mistake of the transcriber. After these ten pages the document goes regularly on with the years of the rule of Abbot Whetehampstede, beginning with the second and ending with the sixteenth, each year ending with some hexameter verses, with here and there a pentameter interspersed, composed with small regard either to rules of syntax or prosody; the latter half of the verse rhyming faintly with the first half, or, in defect of this, the ends of two consecutive verses rhyming together. As regards the matter, there is little of any interest, as it mostly relates to the internal government of the Abbey, and the management of its property; and it appears that Abbot John had his eyes wide open, and provided admirably for the interests of all committed to his charge, not forgetting his own rights and privileges as presiding over an exempt abbey. The quarrel between him and the Bishop of Lincoln was by no means ended, though temporarily arranged at the Council of Pavia, where the Abbot and the Bishop seem to have settled matters amicably. The MS. appears to have been written with tolerable care, and the text is for the most part easy and intelligible, and in this point it presents a most remarkable contrast to the Chronicle which Mr. Riley has printed from the Harleian MS. 3775, at the beginning of the volume. We are unable to say whether it is an original composition or only a transcript. If the former, the compiler was more accurate in writing than in copying, if we may judge from the passages which occur in it which we are able to compare with the text which has been printed elsewhere. At pp. 165-175 we have the ordinances of the Council of Sienna, and the Golden Bull sent by the Emperor John Palaeologus to the Pope, Martin V., printed at length, and the variations in the two texts which arise simply from carelessness of copying are really surprising. At the same time we are bound to admit that the errors are not entirely on one side. In two or three instances the copy in Mr. Riley's volume supplies a better reading than is to be found in the best edition of the *Concilia*. One of these affords so remarkable an illustration of the mode in which a clever transcriber may blunder in copying a document when the words are contracted, that it is worth while to notice it. The Council of Sienna had decreed that as long as the heresies of Wiclif and Huss should flourish there should be a public denunciation of them four times in the year in certain of the more frequented churches *et similiter dictis diebus*, a denunciation with bell and candle of all abettors of such heresy as excommunicated. Now this is plainly the true reading, but the copy in the *Concilia* has substituted by a very adroit though most unfortunate conjecture—*singulis Dominicis diebus*. The mistake is the more important as it would be almost impossible for an ordinary reader of the *Concilia* to detect it. There are two or three other instances in which the reading given in the *Annales* is better than that printed in the *Concilia*, and which suggest doubts as to the correctness and accuracy of other documents contained in the *Concilia*. We notice that in this very page Mr. Riley has ventured to alter the word *doctores*, in which both his own MS. and the reading of the *Concilia* agree, into *doctiores*—a change which to say the least is very questionable.

And here we have an illustration of the mischief that arises from Mr. Riley's inconsistent style of representing the manuscript which he edits. It is the same fault which we have found with all his volumes. He in the most capricious way sometimes prints the text as he finds it in the MS., and sometimes corrects it to what he thinks it ought to have been. Now it is really a hopeless task to attempt to make monkish Latin correct after the fashion of the Augustan age. It is much better, therefore, to take it as it exists, and print it as it was written by the author of the document. We say nothing here of the alteration of the spelling of such words as *sinodus*, *dampnatio*, *oportunitas*, *poterint*, and the like, in which the annalist is invariably consistent, and Mr. Riley equally consistent in altering them into their classical forms, and calling attention to the fact of the alteration in a note. We do not agree with Mr. Riley's practice, even as regards this particular, but there is really no defence to be instituted for piecing a document as he does, sometimes leaving the original reading which is entirely indefensible and a mere mistake on the writer's part, and sometimes altering the mistake into what ought to have been, but was not, written. And here we light upon Mr. Riley's weak point, which would not have been so conspicuous if he had been content to print his documents as he found them.

The fault of which we are speaking is of less importance in this part of the volume, for after all the original and the corrected readings are always to be found either in the notes or in the text; but Mr. Riley has scarcely scholarship enough to deal with the obscure and corrupt passages of the Chronicle which he has prefixed to the *Annals*. The miserable state of the text of this work is the more to be regretted because its contents are of far more interest to the general reader than the detail of matters which refer to the disputes about the property and privileges of the Abbey. And whilst we are on the point of weak scholarship we will advise Mr. Riley, for the benefit of his future title-pages, that the proper way of rendering "to which is prefixed," in Latin, is not *quibus praefigitur*, but *quibus praefixum est*.

And now we proceed to notice the *Chronicon*, which is in fact, as its title imports, an account of what happened in the Abbey, and is almost gossiping in its character. For the benefit of those who do not care to read through the original—and very

hard reading it is—the editor has prefixed an Introduction which contains a minute analysis of it, omitting no matter of any importance. Probably there was no other abbey that saw so much of the outside world as that of St. Alban's, and Mr. Riley truly observes that the features of its history are hardly less those of a Court Chronicle than of a monastic one. Lying as it did on the great Northern road, it was the resort of persons of all degrees, from the highest to the lowest, who were travelling to or from London; and its inmates were in the way of hearing all the news of the day from the perpetual influx of visitors, some of whom went on their journey immediately, and others remained to enjoy the splendid hospitality of the abbot for days or even weeks together. The *Chronicon* gives us in succession an account of the visit of Edmund Mortimer, Earl of March, in the autumn of 1423, and that of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, on the following Christmas. The Earl stayed only a single night, having come simply for the purpose of making his propitiatory offering at the Martyr's shrine, and offering up his prayers for the recovery of his health. The visit of the Duke of Gloucester did not go off quite so quietly. He came with his wife, if wife she could be called who had another husband from whom the Pope refused to allow her to separate, and whose previous marriage was therefore valid. He was attended by a retinue of three hundred followers, whom it was much easier for the authorities of the Abbey to entertain than to keep in order, and the Duke himself was obliged to interfere, and punish one of his people in a summary way by breaking his head, which it may be hoped is expressed in somewhat hyperbolical language, so as to prevent others from poaching on the abbot's preserves.

There are two or three points which the Chronicle and the *Annals* have in common, and amongst them may be noticed the accounts of the burnings of certain Lollards for heresy, and the recantations of others. Some of the former, though not all, have been duly narrated by Foxe, who however is by no means so careful in relating the latter, whilst some have eluded his inquiries altogether, and others have been described with the omission of important particulars. Thus he has chronicled the burning at Tower Hill of Richard Hoveden, a wool-winder and citizen of London, on the 20th of January, 1430; but, perhaps having some perception of the ludicrous, he thought proper to omit what our Chronicle supplies as to the creed of the unfortunate man who was burnt—namely, that the only sacrament of the Church in which he believed was matrimony. The same year, 1430, gives us two more accounts of burnings for heresy, one of which either escaped Foxe's researches altogether, or perhaps was omitted because it was difficult to represent as a martyr one who offered to abjure his heresy if he should be spared from the flames, and his wife and goods restored to him; for on no other terms would he consent to believe in the seven Sacraments of the Church. In the following year another priest, *veteranus et menti insanus*, was burnt in Smithfield, in presence of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. Mr. Riley has described him in his preface as "an aged priest unsound in mind," apparently not noticing that the unsoundness of mind is only, in the Chronicler's view, another mode of describing a heresy, and that the particular form of expression adopted was because of the rhyme between the words *veteranus* and *insanus*. The priest was vicar of Mundon, in Essex. We leave to others to determine why this county was exceptionally prolific in heresy both in this and the following century.

Towards the end of the *Chronicon* we have an account of Jack Sharpe, another Lollard, who figures in the *Fabyan* as an enemy of religious houses, and who seems to have created a considerable disturbance by dispersing papers the purport of which was to deprive the monasteries of their property. The *Chronicon* gives a fuller account of him than is to be met with elsewhere, and Mr. Riley has printed in his Appendix, from the same MS. in the Harleian Library, the petition addressed by him to the Duke of Gloucester on this subject, which is styled *Supplicatio pessima porrecta per Johannem Sharpe Domino Hunfredo Duci Glovernie, regni Protectori, in subversionem ecclesie*. It is in many ways a remarkable document, especially as a very early indication of a prejudice against the possession of property by religious bodies, which was making slow progress among the people, and which in the following century was used as a lever for the destruction of the greater abbeys after the smaller ones had been got rid of on a totally different plea. Jack Sharpe did not mince matters at all, but boldly proposed that the possessions of bishops and abbots should be confiscated, and the proceeds applied partly to the King's use and partly for the endowment of 15 earls, 1,500 knights, 6,000 esquires, and 100 houses of alms. Mr. Riley truly observes that Jack Sharpe's programme was not wholly forgotten, though it was not acted upon when the time for the dissolution of the monasteries came; but he exhibits a slender knowledge of the circumstances of the religious movements of the sixteenth century when he assigns any weight to the jealousy entertained by the bishops for the power of the abbots who were exempt from their jurisdiction, as a moving force which contributed to the destruction of the monastic establishments.

We have referred to the miserable state of the text of the *Chronicon*. We may add that Mr. Riley has done almost nothing towards supplying its numerous defects and errors by conjectural emendation. We scarcely know how to find fault with him for this omission, which, under the circumstances of so very corrupt a text, was almost unavoidable. We have tried our own hand on various passages, but with no sort of success. A single manuscript



copied by a careless scribe almost wholly ignorant of Latin eludes all attempts at correction, and we can only suggest that in all probability the most difficult passages owe their difficulty to the omission of lines or paragraphs where there was a recurrence of the same word or words at short intervals. With the single exception we have mentioned, we are glad to speak in praise of Mr. Riley, whose knowledge of the subject, as well as his skill as an editor, increases as he goes on.

#### NOT WOODED, BUT WON.\*

IN reading this new performance of the author of *Lost Sir Massingberd*, our attention has been forcibly drawn to a phenomenon which we have frequently remarked in the course of our novel-reading. Stated shortly, we may describe it as the curious inclination of readers to look through the spectacles provided for them by writers. Here, for example, we have studied three lively volumes, the interest of which is principally concentrated upon the fortunes of Miss Mabel Denham. We read, as we need hardly say, in that spirit of extreme readiness to detect any flaws in the narrative which is the first duty of a critic. We were prepared to point out with unflinching impartiality that the characters were mere men of straw, that the sentiment was tawdry, that the scenery was ill described, and that the general tendency was immoral—assuming, that is, that any such painful discoveries should fall to our lot. To what discoveries we have been conducted by this method of impartial judgment may perhaps appear in the course of our remarks; but there is one discovery which should have lain upon the surface, and which, we frankly confess, only occurred to us as we were finishing the last pages of the third volume. This discovery—we almost shrink from stating it in plain terms—is that Miss Mabel Denham is little better than an impostor. She is introduced to us, it is true, in a fine gush of enthusiasm, which is cleverly contrasted with a humorous description of the ordinary population of a large sea-side hotel. The lady, we are informed, is of exquisite beauty. Her complexion, though not pale, is as fair as a lily; her look is bright and fresh as the morning; she is rightly called “May,” for “the merry English month” (we pause to remark that this novel was published just at the end of May, 1871) “that heralds summer”—such a summer, for example, as we are now experiencing—“was never better typified by human form.” There is, we are further told, “a breezy air about her that scatters wholesomeness”; her smile, we are assured, is “gracious sunshine”; her tears are “still more gracious rain”; and her words are “flowers of innocence and courtesy.” A very paragon of maidens, we declare, as we take breath after this brilliant outburst of sentiment; and we naturally expect that this heroine, thus announced in all due form, must be as good, as beautiful, and as attractive as the author assures us. But it is singular, considering that we have read in our time the descriptions of, at a moderate estimate, some two thousand heroines, all as beautiful and charming as a free expenditure of eloquence can make them, that this little artifice fairly succeeded in throwing dust in our eyes. We read page after page, fully believing that this exquisite Mabel fairly represented that “not impossible she” whom poets have delighted to describe, and half regretting that she was not a thing of actual flesh and blood, and therefore capable of receiving our respectful homage. Only by slow degrees did a suspicion dawn upon us that we were being imposed upon, and not till the final wind-up of the story, amidst the usual blaze of happy weddings and general congratulations, did the suspicion shape itself into definite form. Is it due to that natural trustfulness of the human race which, in spite of all the experiences of cruel realities, always induces one to believe for a time any statement put forward with a certain amount of confidence? or is it that there is a certain charm about lovely young women which makes even a faint reflection of their excellence too much for critical severity? We must leave this question to the decision of our readers; but meanwhile, in partial justification of ourselves, we will endeavour to set forth as fairly as we can the story as told by the author, and to contrast it with the true story which we have slowly but certainly divined.

Miss Mabel Denham, then, is introduced to us surrounded by a number of ardent admirers; and perhaps this simple device takes us unawares, and causes us to catch the contagion before we have time to assume the defensive. We count at least five of these enthusiasts. In the first place, we regret to say it, must be mentioned the very smart young gentleman who has just married her sister. His admiration is sufficient to cause some severe pangs of jealousy to his young wife, but can have no ulterior consequences, except to prevent him from offering her a home. Next comes a venerable professor, extremely strong upon primeval man, who gives up even a cave full of flint implements and the relics of cave-bears to attend upon this attractive damsel. As he is old enough to be her grandfather, he sees the propriety of speedily retiring from the competition. Thirdly, we have a rich widower of artistic tastes, of old family, and with a magnificent country seat, who, being only old enough to be her father, straightway falls desperately in love with her. Fourthly, there is the son of this last candidate, a fast young officer by profession, and a savage (the word, as we shall see presently,

must be emphasized) by nature, who becomes his father's rival. And, fifthly and lastly, there is a powerful young gentleman in a red shirt, with no particular family or property, but with a considerable claim upon her goodwill, founded upon his having saved her and the three last lovers from what the penny-aliners call a watery grave. That is indeed a startling situation. Imagine a lady in a boat with four men all madly in love with her, and in danger which is all but fatal to the whole party. Nothing could be better adapted to bring out the most furious rivalry, and to provide opportunity for startling displays of character. Passions are rapidly brought to perfection under such circumstances, and, in fact, the rest of the story is an account of the match between these four candidates for the lady's favour. A fair field is early provided for them. The brother-in-law is sent to Hong Kong; Mabel's father dies; and she is thus reduced to extreme poverty. She retires to a remote village, where the only person to make love to her is a young curate of such remarkable weakness that he need not be brought into consideration. The old professor, in sporting language, is speedily out of the betting. He retires to his professorship, and sends her an anonymous present of 200*l.* by way of doing partial justice to his feelings. The young gentleman in a red shirt is too modest to make himself conspicuous at once; he proposes to qualify himself for the undertaking by first acquiring a respectable income as a solicitor, and meanwhile runs, if we may say so, altogether dark. Thus the race is reduced to a match between the two remaining lovers, the father and son. Miss Mabel thinks the father—and very rightly—to be an effete and ill-tempered old dandy, and accordingly refuses him at first. By a pardonable error, however, she attributes the professor's anonymous present to his rival's liberality; and, by a singular process of reasoning, convinces herself, first, that she must accept the benefit, and, secondly, that acceptance imposes upon her the duty of marrying the giver. Accordingly, as soon as he makes a second offer, she accepts it, and becomes the rich Mrs. Winthrop. We are not particularly pleased with this sacrifice of the lovely May; but her deliverance is at hand. Her husband's son is furious at being cut out by his parent. Now, owing to a very singular combination of circumstances, this amiable youth, though the son of her husband's wife, is not really the son of her husband. His true father is a ferocious savage in Patagonia, a mystery which we must be content to leave unexplained. Owing to his parentage, and to his education in the British army (our author has no great love for that noble profession), he shows the most ferocious tendencies; his favourite amusement, indeed, is torturing a large bulldog, and occasionally, when the animal shows fight, hurling him with tremendous violence against the door of the room. The interesting half-breed takes to bullying the step-mother, his love of whom is turned into the bitterest hatred, by sundry methods which show an ingenious mixture of cunning and cruelty. His ferocity, indeed, is such that his father is fairly frightened to death by his son's brutality and a heart disease; and the beautiful Mabel, now become a widow, retires to another remote village, to be safe from his diabolical propensities. Luckily, Providence is down upon him. His bulldog goes mad, bites him, and he dies of hydrophobia, to the general satisfaction of the public; and thus the lovely widow, set free from all her perplexities and left with one interesting son, who is heir to his father's noble estate, is allowed to please herself, which she accordingly does by marrying her surviving lover, the gentleman in a red shirt.

Such is the brief outline of a story in which there are many pleasing incidents which we have been forced by the limits of our space to omit. As we were carried along by it we fully believed in the lovely Mabel. But, as already intimated, we now know better. It is obvious, on reflection, that this is a mere *ex parte* statement. The true state of the case is that Miss Mabel was a very pretty and a very designing young woman. She managed to make the very best out of all her lovers. When in distress she received assistance from the poor old professor, who was obviously not really a marrying man. Then she made a most ingenious excuse of his benevolence to justify herself in marrying another elderly gentleman with a large fortune and a heart disease. Having survived him, according to her calculation, she could safely marry for love the second time, and retired comfortably on what we must venture to call her ill-gotten gains. As for the poor half-mad demi-savage whose existence would have deprived her of the fortune, his death was certainly a piece of good luck on which she could hardly have counted. But she had a device in store, even if he had obstinately continued to live. It consisted in trumping up an absurd story about his Patagonian parentage, which is calmly reported to us as an ascertained fact. We altogether decline to believe in it, even though in that remote village to which she had retired ostensibly in fear of her life she had managed to get hold of an elderly sailor to give testimony to the facts. We suspect that he would have broken down miserably under cross-examination, and that the ferocious Anglo-Patagonian would have turned out to be an ornament to the service, and probably to have distinguished himself in competitive examinations at the Staff College. The story about the bulldog is a palpable exaggeration. Unfortunately, however, in fictitious narratives we are only able to hear one side of the case, and we have frequently wished that more experienced novelists would carry out the method used by Thackeray in *Rebecca and Rowena*, and show us how much could be said for the persons whom their inventors generally delight to run down. We must be content with indi-

\* *Not Wooded, but Won.* By the Author of “*Lost Sir Massingberd*,” &c. 3 vols. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1871.

cating how much might be done by anybody who would describe Miss Mabel Denham's proceedings from an impartial point of view. Taking the story as told, it is, we need hardly remark, decidedly improbable; but, until second thoughts intrude, it may be read with some sympathy and a good deal of amusement.

#### AMERICAN LITERATURE.

THE name of Bayard Taylor will secure a wide circulation and attentive perusal for his translation of the first part of Goethe's *Faust*\*, without requiring from the critic any further recommendation than the mention of its existence. We need not say that Mr. Taylor is an author rather English than American in character; an elegant and thoughtful writer, a scholar of taste as well as of reading, of pure and accurate style and poetic culture, likely perhaps to succeed even better than a competitor of greater eminence in original poetry as the translator of a work so full of national and personal idiosyncrasy as *Faust*. He appreciates fully the importance of metre as an element in the character of a poem, and the consequent impossibility of producing a true and really representative translation in a metre essentially different from that of the original; an impossibility which becomes manifest in proportion to the greatness of the poem and the thoroughness with which the instrument of expression is adapted to and interwoven with the thought and substance. In dealing with Greek and Latin poetry, the translator finds himself between two difficulties in this respect; the genius of the English tongue and its freedom from inflections rendering it unfit for the classical metres, and causing them not only to appear uncouth and unnatural, but to produce an effect, in rhythm and in tone, utterly different from the original; while no English metre so nearly represents the classical as to admit of a reproduction of its form and effect. In translating from one modern language and rhymed metre into another, especially from German into English, the closest resemblance will generally, if not always, be obtained by adhering to the original rhythm. So strongly did Mr. Taylor feel this, and so much stress did he lay on this element of a truthful rendering, that the appearance of a translation of the *Faust* in the original metres, though deficient, as he considered, in "lyrical fire and fluency," and in other essential qualities, caused him for a time to abandon a purpose which he had entertained, as he tells us in his preface, for twenty years. Fortunately he was induced by a longer residence in Germany and a more intimate acquaintance with the language and the author to resume his labour of love; and we have now before us the result of his toils in a translation marked at least by great painstaking, and by a conscientious endeavour to follow the original even in cases where a less literal adhesion, as is certainly true of some passages in which the metrical effect of the English is rough and unsatisfactory, might have done more justice both to author and translator. The present edition is printed and got up with luxurious excellence both in respect of type and paper, and is accompanied by an appendix on the Faustine legends, and a series of interesting and, to unlearned readers, often valuable notes. It is altogether a work which will be a grateful addition to the libraries of all who can afford it; a cheaper edition will be necessary to render it accessible to the large numbers who will no doubt be anxious to possess it.

We have before us three parts of the "Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences"†—a series published for the purpose of giving to the world a variety of contributions too elaborate for a scientific periodical, and not sufficiently popular or not sufficiently important for independent publication. The Academy was founded in 1799, and commenced the publication of Transactions in 1810, suspending it in 1819 on the appearance of the *American Journal of Science*. Now, finding themselves in possession of papers of a character hardly suitable to that periodical, and yet possessing either scientific value or local interest, or both, the members of the Academy resume the production of an independent record of their own. The first volume is divided into two parts, of which the former is occupied principally with a register—or rather several registers—of auroral observations, and a paper on the "Meteorology of Newhaven," the capital of the State, with a shorter essay on Bekker's "Digammated Text of Homer." The latter part of the volume contains a contribution of magnitude and pretension worthy of appearing as an independent work—Verrill's "Notes on Radiata," occupying over 300 pages, and accompanied by several interesting illustrations. The first part of the second volume—the last that has come to hand—contains some "Contributions on American Crustacea," and an essay on the "Topographical Features of the Newhaven Region."

A Report on New York Savings Banks ‡, presented to the State Legislature, illustrates at once the peculiarities of American government in its supervision of quasi-public institutions, and some of the less pleasant peculiarities of American commerce

and finance. It is curious to English readers to find an American official attacking a Bill actually before the Legislature as so iniquitous that he cannot conceive its passing to be possible. It is also curious to see how little official power the Superintendent of the Banking Department enjoys, and yet how fully his duties of inspection appear to employ him. The sufferers by some English Companies can well understand how much protection might be given by a public officer authorized only to inspect and report, without the slightest power of interference, and may be induced to envy the depositors in the banks of New York. On the other hand, we regret to find the Superintendent noting grave derelictions of duty on the part of Savings Bank trustees; observing on the injustice and impropriety of allowing Savings Banks to be associated with Insurance Companies and other extraneous speculations; pointing out that the names of the persons inserted as directors, &c., in Bills of Incorporation afford no security to investors, inasmuch as these persons are very often absolutely ignorant of the whole matter till informed of it by himself; and thinking it necessary gravely to advise that no charter shall be granted save on the petition of the persons proposed to be thereby incorporated. On the whole, the effect of the Report is not to strengthen confidence in the Savings Banks—a cause for the more regret that their liabilities exceed 40,000,000*l.* sterling for the single State of New York, and appear to be increasing by more than 6,000,000*l.* a year—enormous sums for a State less populous than Ireland.

The most interesting work on our list for this month, beyond all comparison, is the *Life of General Lee*\*, by Mr. J. E. Cooke, who, though he assumes no military title, appears, by internal evidence and by one or two direct references to his personal presence on certain occasions, to have been an officer in the Confederate army of Northern Virginia, and, we should fancy, temporarily at least, a member of the staff of its revered chief. The work is in many respects defective, especially from the fact that the writer appears to have been unauthorised and unassisted by the General's family, and is consequently almost without information as to the early life of his hero. Indeed, probably from the want of material, he has confined his narrative almost exclusively to the Confederate War of Independence, passing over with a slight and cursory mention the previous services which had led General Scott to recognise Lee as incomparably the ablest officer in the Federal army, and his own fitting successor. This is a remarkable and unquestioned fact, and it leads directly to an inference which ought to silence the offensive and very ungenerous language in which certain Northern and English politicians have been wont to speak of the "wicked rebellion" of the South. The leading officers of the Confederacy were the men who, if they had chosen to remain in the Federal service, would have commanded the army of the Union. Albert Sydney Johnstone was Lee's immediate senior, and Lee himself and his comrades of the 2nd Cavalry were marked as the picked men of the army. Two of Lee's subordinates in that regiment were among the ablest and most distinguished of Grant's lieutenants; and no one can doubt that their seniors in rank and equals or superiors in ability might have at once commanded the forces of the Union if they had chosen to do so. The temptation to adhere to their colours must have been very strong; yet almost every Southern officer threw in his lot with his State. Only the fanaticism of faction would dare to ascribe unworthy motives to any of them—to Lee himself the most violent of English Radicals never ventured to impute anything of the sort; all sordid considerations tended the other way; all of them were men of high honour and virtue; many, like Lee and Jackson, of pure and deep religion; many of them did not approve of secession; yet one and all threw up their commissions, and fought, and suffered for the Southern cause. We needed no biography of General Lee to assure us that he was one of the best men and truest Christians, as well as one of the noblest soldiers and greatest generals, of whom history bears witness; but it is impossible to read this story of his life without finding our admiration of his character deepened and strengthened. His fellow-citizens evidently had, from the first, profound and entire confidence in him; a confidence which must have been due as much to the force of personal character as to his long past services in the Mexican War, when he—a Captain of Engineers—was one of the interior military Council of the Commander-in-Chief, and one of those to whom the latter chiefly ascribed the completeness of the victory. He was not successful in his first operations—a fact which his biographer explains, or explains away—yet he was as thoroughly trusted as ever by Virginia, and was selected by the Confederate Government to replace General J. Johnstone in the command of the principal army of the South. From that time his history is the history of the Virginian army; and his personality impresses itself on the character of that army. No atrocities on the part of the enemy, bitterly as he felt them, could move him to anger or provoke him to revenge; after his native State had been ravaged and his own home destroyed in wanton spite, by the direct orders of the Federal Government and its favourite generals, he refused to retaliate, or even to exercise the common rights of an invader in Pennsylvania; and in its self-restraint, as in its heroic courage and unfaltering firmness, the army imitated the example of its chief. His relations with a man like Jackson, whom no ordinary

\* *Faust*. A Tragedy by Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. The First Part. Translated in Original Metres by Bayard Taylor. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

† *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*. Vol. I, Parts I. and II. Vol. 2, Part I. Newhaven: Published by the Academy. London: Trübner & Co. 1866.

‡ *Annual Report of the Superintendent of the Banking Department, relative to Savings Banks*. Transmitted to the Legislature, March 15, 1871. Albany: The Argus Company. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

\* *A Life of Gen. Robert E. Lee*. By John Estlin Cooke. With Illustrations, Portraits, and Maps. New York: Appleton & Co. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.



chief could have kept in steady co-operation and due subordination, and of whom any ordinary chief would have been jealous, but who regarded Lee with absolute veneration, and was treated by him "as his own right hand," testify in no common manner to the real greatness of the man. We find, from Mr. Cooke's narrative, that Lee was equally successful with the utterly different character of Stuart, the representative Cavalier, as Jackson was the typical Puritan. Even when Stuart's misconception of orders took the cavalry out of reach of the main army, and contributed in no small degree to the loss of Gettysburg, Lee appears to have spoken no word of complaint. To all under him he was ever ready to give credit; on himself he was ever ready to take responsibility and blame; and those under him requited him in kind. Mr. Cooke's account of the temper of the army as it fell back from the fatal heights of Gettysburg, thinned, baffled, exhausted, but still shouting aloud its unshaken confidence in "Uncle Robert," has its fitting pendant in Lee's own words—"It is I who have lost this battle; you must help me out." It was perhaps as much this wonderful power over his men as his admirable genius for war that enabled him to face threefold numbers, and never, save at Gettysburg, to be beaten in the field. Mr. Cooke shows that, except on the Chickahominy and at Gettysburg, where he took the offensive, Lee was always outnumbered by nearly two to one; and at Chancellorsville, where he divided his army and attacked the enemy at once in front and flank, he had not more than one to three. Of course this inferiority of force exposed him to be worn out by sheer loss of men; and this Grant saw. "He could afford to lose ten men for one"—and he actually does seem to have lost three or four for one even in the campaign which ended in the surrender of Appomattox Court House. After that event Lee's life was one of silence and retirement—it could not be a life of obscurity—and finally, while still far from old age and of robust frame, he died, really, if not literally, from a broken heart. But, painful as his latter years were, they were full of such honour as is rarely paid to a fallen leader; he was still the idol, the guide, the counsellor of his people; still the object of reluctant reverence from the conquerors, of deep respect from those who had fought against him, of admiration from the world, of passionate affection from his countrymen; and, warm as was the sympathy felt for the Southern people, a large part of the respect paid to them in their misfortunes must be ascribed to the profound impression made on the world by the character of General Lee. We trust ere long to have some better and more authorised biography of him than this. In the meantime this is acceptable as the only one we have; and, despite some deficiency of literary aptitude on the writer's part, it is not a wholly unworthy monument to the memory of one of the greatest soldiers and noblest gentlemen that ever spoke the common mother-tongue of England and America.

Whatever may be the virtues of a democratic polity, one of those which should seem theoretically to be inseparable from it is never in modern times ascribed to it by any persons who have had practical experience of its working. It does not extinguish, or even seem to diminish, flunkeyism. There are, no doubt, democracies from which that vice is effectually eradicated; but there democracy is a social fact as well as a political principle; manners are simple because fortunes are small and equal, and snobbery withers for sheer want of nourishment. In America it is at least as rife as in England, and perhaps more offensive, inasmuch as the social standard is a lower one and the objects of flunkey-worship are meaner. In the absence of rank, and of respect for birth, wealth is the sole distinction open to ordinary men, and the only one which ordinary men are capable of appreciating; in the absence of an aristocracy to keep down the ostentation of the *nouveaux riches* by an example of dignified reserve and a certain proud simplicity, the objects of popular envy are made the subjects of a gross flattery and an openness of public comment which only thoroughly-bred parvenus could endure. Thus the so-called highest society of the States—especially in the North—the men of wealth and political eminence and their families, are very far indeed from being the best; and if we were to take our idea of American character and manners from the volume before us—"The Court Circles of the Republic"—we should do grievous wrong to our kinsmen beyond the Atlantic. To the Adamses, Everetts, and Winthrops of Massachusetts, the Randolphs, Lees, and Peytons of Virginia, the kind of adulation herein paid to eminent politicians and distinguished women, the personal anecdotes of the former and personal descriptions of the latter—in which, after all, this book falls far short of the in pertinence of American newspapers—would be quite as offensive as to the class of English country gentlemen from whom they descend. Putting this aside, a description of the society of Washington under every successive President, from the first to the last, interspersed with anecdotes of the chiefs of the Executive and of the principal statesmen of each generation, cannot be wholly devoid of interest, and is at

least readable and entertaining; if it seems to us to present a somewhat curious commentary now and then on the democratic principles and professions of the subjects of the narrative. It is interesting, too, to read between the lines the gradual change which passed over the White House and its "Court Circles" between the departure of Washington and the accession of Lincoln; and the decline of American polity from the aristocracy of the revolutionary statesmen to the democracy whose practical faith is that of the Irishman—that "one man is as good as another, and a long sight better too."

The Life of Dr. George Junkin\*, an eminent Presbyterian divine, a Pennsylvanian by birth, a Virginian by adoption, and a fugitive during the War of Secession, is valuable partly as illustrating the life and work of an American pastor in the older States, partly as throwing light upon the history of the sect to which he belonged, and incidentally on that of others, during a period of change and transition in theological opinion which produced much controversy and many painful divisions in the Churches of America.

Ten Great Religions†, by James F. Clarke, is an elaborate account of the religious tenets, practices, and ceremonies of the principal races of the world, so far as history or ancient monuments have preserved them. The "ten" are the Chinese religion or philosophy, Brahminism, Buddhism, the Persian or Zoroastrian religion, the Paganisms of Egypt, Greece, Rome, and Scandinavia, Islam, and Judaism; all of them treated in a sober and philosophical temper, and illustrated by a quantity of citations from the remains of the various religious writings themselves, from the authors who have treated of them, or from modern accounts of their ruined temples and monuments.

Mr. Soule's "Dictionary of English Synonyms"‡ is intended to serve writers of English prose in the manner in which schoolboys, when first learning Latin composition, are wont to use a Gradus—theoretically to furnish "the word or expression that best suits a particular turn of thought," practically to supply the defects of a limited vocabulary. We trust that the writers who may use the Dictionary will employ it somewhat more intelligently and with more discrimination than generally goes to the use of a Gradus; otherwise American penny-a-lining may become an even more astounding and more sesquipedalian phenomenon than the English branch of the art.

Mr. Horace Greeley§, so well known in the political arena, comes forward in this treatise on farming as a practical teacher of agriculture on a modest scale and in an unpretentious manner, advising the beginner on general principles and points of experience rather than on scientific doctrines or details of husbandry. The book, especially in its earlier portions, may be of material service to emigrants, as warning them against some natural impudences, and against the impulses of ambition and impatience at first starting, and showing them how to turn a small capital to the best account under social and economical conditions utterly different from those of England, and how to proceed if they have to start without any capital. We do not venture to set our judgment against Mr. Greeley's; but writers of as intimate and, we fancy, wider practical knowledge do not agree with him in considering the East as good a field for agricultural enterprise as the West. The work is "admirably dedicated" to the future inventor of a steam-plough which shall pulverize to a depth of two feet, at a cost of two dollars per acre, ten acres per day.

A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon and Early English||, by Professor Corson, of the Cornell University, contains a number of selections from the Anglo-Saxon Testament, the works of King Alfred, the old English Chronicles, and the Aenbite of Inwyt, with a glossary. One extract of some length is printed "in the so-called Anglo-Saxon character," in order to assist the reader to understand other works in which that character is used.

Bret Harte's Condensed Novels¶ have already found their way to our railway bookstalls; and those who have not already laughed over *Lothar*, and smiled at the quieter humour of the *Haunted Man*, had better secure so certain an amusement for the next dull half-hour that fate may have in store for them.

Mr. Hay's poems do not generally rise above the fatal mediocrity that damns a poet; but the *Pike County Ballads\*\**, few as they are, are enough to make a reputation for their author with all who are not offended by the air of irreverence which attaches to that

\* *The Reverend George Junkin, D.D., LL.D. A Historical Biography.* By D. K. Junkin, D.D. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

† *Ten Great Religions. An Essay in Comparative Theology.* By James Freeman Clarke. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

‡ *A Dictionary of English Synonyms and Synonymous or Parallel Expressions. Designed as a Practical Guide to Aptness and Variety of Phraseology.* By Richard Soule. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

§ *What I Know of Farming. A Series of brief and plain Expositions of Practical Agriculture as an Art based upon Science.* By Horace Greeley. New York: Carleton & Co. Sold by the Tribune Association. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1871.

|| *A Handbook of Anglo-Saxon and Early English.* By Hiram Corson, M.A., Professor in the Cornell University. New York: Holt & Williams. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

¶ *Condensed Novels.* By Bret Harte. With Illustrations by S. Eyttinger, Junr. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

\*\* *Pike County Ballads, and other Pieces.* By John Hay. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1871.

\* *The Court Circles of the Republic, or the Beauties and Celebrities of the Nation; illustrating Life and Society under eighteen Presidents; describing the Social Features of the Successive Administrations from Washington to Grant; the Drawing-room Circles; the Prominent Statesmen and Leading Ladies; the Brilliant Belles and Distinguished Visitors; the Principal Entertainments; Fashionable Styles of Dress; Manners, Etiquette, Anecdotes, Incidents, &c. &c. Illustrated with Original Portraits, splendidly Engraved on Steel.* By Mrs. E. F. Ellett, Author of "The Women of the American Revolution," "The Queens of American Society," &c. &c. With Sketches by Mrs. E. E. Mack. Sold by Subscription only. Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Publishing Company. New York: J. D. Denison. London: Sampson Low, Son, & Marston. 1870.

familiar mode of dealing with sacred ideas inherited by Americans from the Puritans of New England, and twisted by modern habits of elang into a form still more grotesque, but perhaps with less of essential vice in it, than the Biblical cant associated with the name of Praise-God-Barebones and the Roundheads of the Commonwealth, as well as with the "professors" of the Scotch Covenantant.

## NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Now ready, VOLUME XXXI., bound in cloth, price 10s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

## THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

## CONTENTS OF No. 821, JULY 22, 1871:

- Mr. Gladstone and the House of Lords.  
Decentralization in France. New Investments.  
The French Army. The Ballot Debates. A Pleasant Anniversary.  
Municipal Corporations and Private Bills.  
The Eltham Murder and the Police.  
Leisure. The Contagious Diseases Acts.  
Decayed Boroughs. Vague People.  
The London School Board and Compulsory Education. Italian Corruption.  
International Exhibition.—The Picture Galleries.  
Eton and Harrow at Lord's.  
Morelet's Central America.  
Miss Anstey's Lady Susan. Fronde's Short Studies.  
Blackie's Colloquia Græca. Girdlestone's Arithmetic. Chronicles of St. Alban's.  
Not Wood, but Won. American Literature.

## CONTENTS OF No. 820, JULY 15, 1871:

- England and Germany.—The Ballot Debates.—The Army Bill in the Lords.—The White Flag.—The New York Riots.—Spain.—Lord Grey's Proposed Standing Orders.—The French Council of Public Instruction.—Mr. Cardwell under Ordinary Circumstances.  
Feminine Humour.—The Cinder-Sifters of the fable Market.—St. Katharine's Hospital.—The Latest Phase of the German Catholic Movement.—Dogs and Roughs.—School Boards and Cumulative Voting.—Carlsbrooke—Psychic Force.—Newmarket July Meeting.  
Masson's Life of Milton.—Kingsley's At Last.—Parody, Ancient and Modern.—Books about the War.—Mrs. Trevelyan's Historical Lectures.—Elliot's Coffee-Planting in Mysore.—Joshua Marvel.—German Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

## ADVERTISEMENTS.

**LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1871.**  
The General Public are admitted EVERY WEEK-DAY (except Wednesday) from 10 A.M. to 6 P.M., on payment of ONE SHILLING. On Wednesdays the price is Half-a-Crown.

**LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.**  
The General Rules for the Exhibition of Selected Specimens of all varieties of Fine and Decorative Art with Scientific Inventions, and the Manufactures of JEWELLERY, COTTON, MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS, PAPER, and PRINTING, with their Machinery, may now be had of the Attendants in the present year's Exhibition, and by letter addressed to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

**JEWELLERY in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.**—The Trades interested in Jewellery and its Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

**COTTON in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.**—Trades interested in Cotton and its Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

**PRINTING, PAPER and STATIONERY in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.**—Trades interested in Printing, Paper and Stationery, and their Machinery.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

**MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS in the INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION of 1872.**—Trades interested in Musical Instruments.—Selected Specimens of which will be Exhibited in 1872—may obtain the General Rules at the present year's Exhibition, or by written application to the Secretary.—Offices, Royal Albert Hall, Kensington.

**CRYSTAL PALACE.—THIS DAY and NEXT WEEK.**  
THIS DAY, JULY 22, NORTH GRAND SUMMER CONCERT; RECITAL of MOZART'S "NOZZE DI FIGARO" at Three.

TUESDAY, OPERA at Three.  
WEDNESDAY, FOUNTAIN and GARDEN FÊTE.  
THURSDAY, OPERA at Three.  
SATURDAY, GRAND SUMMER CONCERT.

The Fine Art Courts and Collections, the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various Illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music and Fountains daily.

Admission each day, 1s, excepting Saturday, when the charge is 6s.; or by Ticket purchased before the day, 2s. 6d.; Guinea Season Tickets free.

**AUTOTYPE GALLERY, 36 Rathbone Place, W.—GRAND EXHIBITION of AUTOTYPE PICTURES daily, from Ten till Five. Admission free.**

**DORÉ GALLERY.—GUSTAVE DORÉ, 35 New Bond Street.**  
EXHIBITION of PICTURES (including "CHRISTIAN MARTYRS," "MONASTERY," "TRIUMPH OF CHRISTIANITY," "FRANCESCA DE RIMINI"). Ten to Six.—Admission, 1s.

**BRITISH ASSOCIATION for the ADVANCEMENT of SCIENCE.**—The next ANNUAL MEETING of this Association will be held at EDINBURGH, commencing on Wednesday 2nd, and continuing till Wednesday, 5th August, 1871.

The EXCURSIONS will take place on Thursday, 10th August, 1871, the particulars of which will be duly notified.

President Elect.—Professor Sir WILLIAM THOMSON, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S. &c., Prof. of Natural Philosophy in the University of Glasgow.

NEW MEMBERS and ASSOCIATES are Elected by the Executive Committee at Edinburgh, on the following conditions:

New Annual Subscribers, for a payment of £2 for the First Year.

Associates for this Meeting only, for a payment of £1.

New Life Members, for a composition of £10.

Ladies may become Members or Associates on the same terms as Gentlemen, and Ladies' Tickets (transferred only) may be obtained by Members on payment of £1.

Gentlemen who have in any former year been admitted Members of the Association, may on this occasion renew their Membership, without being called upon for arrears, on payment of £1.

Information about local arrangements and facilities afforded by the Railway and Steamboat Companies will be obtained on application to the Local Secretaries, at their Chambers, 14 Young Street, Edinburgh.

Notices of Papers proposed to be read must be sent to G. GRIFFITH, M.A., Assistant-General Secretary of the British Association, 14 Young Street, Edinburgh, before August 1.

**ROYAL INSTITUTION of GREAT BRITAIN,**  
Albemarle Street, W.

The next ACTONIAN PRIZE, or PRIZES, will be Awarded in the year 1873 to an Essay, or Essays, illustrative of the Wisdom and Benevolence of the Almighty.

The subject is "The Theory of the Evolution of Living Things." The Prize Fund is Two Hundred Guineas, and it will be awarded as a single Prize, or in sums of not less than One Hundred Guineas each, or withheld altogether, as the Managers in their judgment shall think proper.

Competitors for the Prize are requested to send their Essays to the Royal Institution, on or before June 30, 1872, addressed to the Secretary; and the adjudication will be made by the Managers in December, 1872.

July, 1871.

H. BENCE JONES, *Honorary Secretary R.I.*

**ZOOLOGICAL RECORD ASSOCIATION.**—This Association has been formed for the purpose of continuing the publication of the "RECORD OF ZOOLOGICAL LITERATURE," commenced six years ago by Dr. GÜNTHER, F.R.S., who has resigned the Editorship to Professor NEWTON.

The "Record" consists of an Annual Volume, containing a very complete Abstract of, and Index to, the Zoological Literature of the preceding year, and its use has been so generally recognised that for the last four years the British Association has voted (on the unanimous recommendation of the Committee of the Biological Section) a liberal grant in its aid.

The Contributors to the forthcoming volume are:

- Mammalia, Reptilia, and Pisces.—Dr. GÜNTHER, F.R.S.  
Aves.—H. E. DRESSER, F.Z.S., and H. B. S. PETER, F.L.S.  
Mollusca, Molluscoida, and Crustacea.—Dr. E. VON MARTENS, F.M.Z.S.  
Arachnida and Myriopoda.—Rev. O. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, C.M.Z.S.  
Coleoptera and Hymenoptera.—E. C. RYE.  
Lepidoptera.—W. F. KIRBY.  
Diptera.—G. H. VERNALL.  
Neuroptera and Orthoptera.—R. M'LELLAN, F.L.S.  
Rhynchota.—JOHN SCOTT.  
Vermes.—E. RAY LANKESTER.  
Echinodermata, Celerata, and Protozoa.—Professor TRAQUAIR, M.D.

This Association consists of Members and Subscribers. The "Members" are liable to the extent of £3, in the event of the funds from all other sources not being equal to meet the Annual Expenditure.

"Subscribers" pay annually on the 1st July Twenty Shillings, but incur no other liability. Gentlemen wishing to join the Association as Members or as Subscribers are requested to communicate with the Secretary, H. T. STANTON, F.R.S., Mountfield, Lewisham, near London, S.E.

\* \* \* \* \* Upwards of Eighty of the leading Zoologists of the Country have joined the Association as "Members."

**MALVERN COLLEGE.**

The THIRD TERM will begin on Wednesday, September 20.  
Terms of Tuition and Board, £50 per Annum.  
For Clergymen's Sons after Examination, £20.  
Three Scholarships worth £50 per Annum for One or for Two Years to be examined for in December.

For details, apply to the SECRETARY.

**INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—Mr. J. ASHTON,**  
M.A. (Fifth Wrangler), prepares CANDIDATES for the above and other Examinations. At the recent Examination for the Engineering College, Eight of the successful Candidates were Pupils of Mr. Ashton. Next Term begins August 1.—Address, 41 King Henry's Road, S. Hampstead.

**INDIAN ENGINEERING COLLEGE, CIVIL SERVICE,**  
and WOOLWICH.—Rev. Dr. HUGHES (Wrang. Joh. Col. Cam.) is now filling up his Vacancies for the Next Term. All the subjects taught by experienced men.—Castlebar Court, Ealing, W.

**INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—Mr. W. M. LUPTON,** who takes a limited number of PUPILS, has been very successful at the recent Examination for the above, and at the last Examination for INDIAN TELEGRAPH his Pupils obtained 2nd, 6th, and 17th places.—Address, Sedburgh House, South Hill Park, Hampstead.

**INDIAN CIVIL ENGINEERING COLLEGE.—The**  
Rev. W. H. JOHNSTONE, M.A., Bromsgrove House, Croydon, formerly Professor, Examiner, and Chaplain in the Royal Military Engineer College, Addiscombe, and Assistant-Examiner for the Engineer appointments under the Indian Public Works Department, receives a few PUPILS, and has just passed Four for the Indian Civil Engineer College.

**THE HARTLEY INSTITUTION, SOUTHAMPTON.—NEXT TERM COMMENCES September 17.** Three Exhibitions, giving Free Education, and tenable in the Departments of General Literature and Science, or of Engineering and Technical Science, will be opened to new Students. Special Preparation for the Indian Engineering, Forest and Telegraph Examinations, and for University of London Degrees.—Address THIS PRINCIPAL.

**EDUCATION.—BRUSSELS.—An ENGLISH LADY,**  
residing in Brussels, offers to YOUNG LADIES desirous of completing their education on the Continent the comforts of an English Home combined with great Educational advantages. Highest references. Terms, 100 Guineas a Year.—For particulars, apply to Mrs. H. E. M., care of Messrs. Henry & Co., 45 Cornhill, London.

**HOMELESS BOYS of LONDON, REFUGES for HOMELESS and DESTITUTE CHILDREN, and CHICHESTER TRAINING SHIP.**  
Upwards of 500 Boys and Girls are now being supported in these Refuges and Ship.

Owing to the benevolent and praiseworthy exertions which have for several months been made to aid the Sick and Wounded in the late War, the funds for the support of these Refuges and Ship have decreased considerably.

An urgent APPEAL is, therefore, made for ASSISTANCE to support the Inmates. 415 will keep a Boy or a Girl for One Year, and £1 5s. for a Month.

Contributions thankfully received by the London and Westminster Bank, 214 High Holborn, W.C., and 41 Lothbury, E.C., and by

Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Secretary.

**PICTURES, BRONZES, and WORKS of ART on SALE at**  
39 Southampton Street, Strand. Pictures Cleaned, Lined, and Restored, if in worst condition. Frames Cleaned or Regilt equal to New. Sales attended on Commission.

CHARLES DEAR, 39 Southampton Street, Strand.